

~~1064 9 29~~

THE 1047 P. 19

**Popish Proselyte**

THE  
GRAND FANATICK.

OR AN  
ANTIDOTE

AGAINST

The Poyson of Captain Robert  
Everard's Epistle to the several  
Congregations of the Non-  
conformists.

*And many other Signs and Wonders truly  
did Jesus in the presence of his Dis-  
ciples, which are not written in this  
Book: But these are written that ye  
might believe that Jesus is the Christ,  
the Son of God, and that in believing  
you might have life through his name.  
John 20. 30, 31.*

London, Printed for Samuel Tidmarsh, at the  
Kings Head in Cornhill, next House to the  
Royal Exchange. MDC LXXXIV.

RIGHT  
Copyright of James

ANTHONY & CO

10, N. B. ST. W. L.

DED. WILLIAMS'S LIBRARY  
RED CROSS STREET  
LONDON.

And many other things which have been  
the subject of the purchase of the life  
of the author, and the author's family  
and the life of the author's family  
and the life of the author's family  
and the life of the author's family  
and the life of the author's family  
and the life of the author's family  
and the life of the author's family

THE LIBRARY OF THE  
MUSEUM OF THE  
MUSEUM OF THE  
MUSEUM OF THE





## TO THE READER.

**A** *N exact answering of  
the whole Epistle by  
Paragraphs, would  
have swelled my in-  
tended little Book in-  
to a great Volume ; nor did I con-  
ceive it needful : and that because  
the Captain himself hath contracted  
the pith of all that is pertinent,  
into his sixth reason against the  
Scriptures being a Rule ; His  
Argument from Heaven for the*

## To the Reader.

Roman Church being Judge and Guide ; and his six Queries supposed utterly destructive to, and altogether unanswerable upon , the grounds of Protestants ; and now all these be at large transcribed, examined, and solved : And yet lest the less intelligent Reader should stumble, or the Adversary insult ; I have in an admonitory prefatory discourse so far taken notice of all his mostly seeming important conclusions and objections, as to make it apparent that they have nought else, save ignorance, inadvertency, selfishness, and strong delusion to support, and give rise unto them. Nor yet have I made it my only business to pull down (though that must needs be their great work that have to do with Babel-builders) but have all along ascertained what I would or should establish, from such common principles of Religion and Reason, as are assented to by Papists, Prote-

## To the Reader.

Protestants, and the Universality at least of Christians. As for reviling, had not his own guilt put him on to caution against it, I should never have thought of it; what is of personal concern is occasioned by his own writings, circumstant to the matter under debate, and all contained in one single Page; the whole is closed with a vindication of the Great Saint Augustin from favouring the proceedings of so grand an Apostate as Robert Everard.

Joseph Harrifon.

---

To the Reader

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the book of the Great Spirit, which I have the pleasure to inform you is now in the hands of the printer, and will be ready for sale in a few days. I have also the pleasure to inform you that the book of the Great Spirit is now in the hands of the printer, and will be ready for sale in a few days. I have also the pleasure to inform you that the book of the Great Spirit is now in the hands of the printer, and will be ready for sale in a few days.

Joseph H. H. H.

*An Answer to Robert Everard's Epistle to the several Congregations of the Nonconformists.*

**I** Shall at present suppose *Robert Everard* to be no Romish Jesuited Priest, but *Quondam Captain* Pag. 91. to a Troop of *Rebellious Soldiers*, and do conclude from his own Printed papers, attended with some obvious circumstances, that four things did chiefly concur to the shipwrecking of his Faith; *First*, Ignorance. *Secondly*, Inadvertency, or Imprudence. *Thirdly*, Self-interest. *Fourthly*, A just judgment of God in sending such strong delusions, that they should believe a lie.

The mans ignorance appears, *First* in that he cannot construe, *credo Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam*, I believe the Being, but renders (as if he had read) *credo Sancta*, &c. I be-

lieve the saying, of the Holy Catholick Church; sets hence in the front of his Book, and urges all a-long, the Churches, and in the issue the Roman Churches pretended infallible declaration for the foundation of Faith. When yet the very Creed teacheth him

*First*, To confess, *I believe in God the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost*, as that which must necessarily forego and found his believing first that there is a Holy Catholick Church, as well as that there is a Communion of Saints; nor doth it give any more ground to conclude the one, than the other for to be infallible. *Secondly*, Though the Captain before the closure of the Book, be so well taught, as to prove the Roman Church infallible in teaching, from certain stories about Miracles no more than pointed at, out of *Breerleys Index*, no more than surmised to be done by *S. Francis, S. Dominick*, and the Monk *Austin*, with such like, to confirm, and that but some few of her superstitious Doctrins; Nay can chide such, as Persons destroying Faith, taking away all humane converse,



verse, &c. that shall refuse upon such fallible Testimonies to believe stories so extremely improbable; yet is he such a Novice in the beginning, that he cannot so much as offer an argument for the truth of Christianity, from all the undoubted Miracles wrought by Christ and his Apostles, for no other end save the confirming thereof, *Heb. 2. 3, 4.* recorded in Sacred Writ, that we might believe, *John 20. 31.* not denied by the Adversaries of our Faith, and most celebriously attested by the unanimous consent of all Christians in all succeeding Ages. Nor has he a word to say to the Gentleman that in opposition to the Evangelist, calls Faith thus founded, an opinion, an humour; But instead of that, *gratis* grants, that unless we know what *ex parte rei* is impossible to be known, our selves or those that teach us to be infallible, Christianity as to us, can be no more than probably, not most probably true. *Jews, Turks, and Pagans* may be as well perswaded of their several ways, as we can be of ours; both upon a fallible certainty: Nor knowing sure, that the Christians  
[cer-

[certainty] hath no [fallible] save that they may; the *Jews, Turks and Pagans* [fallible] no [certainty] save that they do, *imagine* it.

And *secondly*, that it is irrational thus to argue, à *Doctore ad Doctrinam*, from the Person to the thing, from what may be, to what is. *Eucled* may be fallible, and yet his demonstrations not deceive; we may know our selves, and those that teach us, to be subject to mistake; and yet know too, that in this or that particular neither they nor we are mistaken.

Christianity as to us may be certainly true; certainly so demonstrated to *Jews, Turks and Pagans*: and yet every Man confessed to be a liar, every Church *ex parte sui* in a possibility to commit an error in this thing; But,

3dly. The man cannot distinguish betwixt the internal testimony of the spirit vouchsafed sometimes unto some, and that constant historical evidence which is afforded unto all. When he was a *Quaker*, it's like he confounded the original Cause, and the original Language, and now he cannot make a difference betwixt the efficient cause of our believing, and the formal object,

ject, ground or Reason of Faith. He discourfes with a man fenfual, as if he had the fpirit; and imagines, that the Holy Ghoft, which is fent to witnefs with our fpirits that we are the children of God, fhould in the fame manner and meafure, witnefs the Divine truth of every particular Book and Text of Scripture. And hence inftead of Firftly telling the fenfual Lay Gentleman, that he believed the Scriptures to be the word of God *fide Historica*, by an Historical Faith, upon the account of univerfal Tradition; He talks with him about an inward infallible Testimony of the Spirit, and makes that fpiritual fenfe and feeling, which is peculiar to Gods Elect fealing up their intereft in Chrift, to be the common convincing ground of that being indeed the Spirits Testimony. And whereas he fhould have refolved his faith into the Sovereign Authority, and verity of God himfelf fpeaking in Scriptures as the formal ground thereof, and into the fpirits inlightning, inlivening Power as the efficient caufe; He refolves it wholly into an inward Testimony of the fpirit, of which,

(for

(for ought appears) neither of the twain (save by hear-say) knew any thing at all. However instead of the Spirit's testimony, the man might better have said in this case, simply by the Spirit; by the Spirit (*scilicet*) as that *medium facultatis* whereby we are enabled to see and believe scriptural verities to be Divine. Albeit, as Dr. Ames well observeth, there is a sufficient and certain representation proposed to us in the Scripture, both of things that are to be believed; and of that Reason upon which we ought to believe them. See *Rom. 16.26.* Nor yet,

*used in l. 1.*  
*2.c.5.*

*Fourthly*, Does he perceive the difference betwixt faith Dogmatical complex, assenting to the truth of Divine propositions, and that faith which we call salvificall, incomplete, fixing on, adhering to, and resting in Jesus Christ alone? That may be various, respect had to its object; the same man knows such a proposition to be revealed to morrow, which he knows not to day; and consequently, believe that to morrow, which to day he does not. This, respect had to the object, varies not.

not: It's *Jesus*, the same Yesterday, to Day,  
and for ever. Though yet respect had  
to the Subject like as the other, it's  
sometimes weaker or stronger, confu-  
sed, or more distinct. And hence men  
of different faiths incomplex cannot  
be saved; for there is no other name under  
Heaven given, &c. Acts 4. 12. other foun-  
dation can no man lay, than that is laid,  
which is *Jesus Christ*, 1 Cor. 3. 11. oneness  
of Faith, as to this, is commended  
and commanded, Eph. 4. 5. compared  
with Eph. 4. 13. unto the unity of  
the Faith and knowledge of the Son  
of God. He that believeth on the Son  
of God, hath life Eternal; and he that  
believeth not, &c. John 3. 36. But men  
may be of different faiths complex,  
believe diverse, nay contrary propo-  
sitions, and yet through Grace  
obtain salvation. Some build Gold,  
Silver, precious Stones; some Wood,  
Hay, Stubble; one believeth he may  
eat all things; another who is weak, eateth  
Herbs, Rom. 14. 2.

Fifthly and Lastly, the man seems  
not to know of any difference betwixt  
an acquired Habit and a Divine Gift,  
the requisites to our getting of Science,  
and Gods giving of Faith. Science, it's  
true

true (as *Thomas* determines) cannot be had, unless we first know the certainty of the *Medium*, or Reason whereby the conclusion is demonstrated; but it is impertinent to Faith, as *Estius* well concludes, by what means we believe the prime Verity, that is, by what means God useth to bestow on men the gift of Faith. He may do it as well by the preaching of the meanest Minister, as of the greatest Apostle: for indeed neither the one nor the other is or needs to be (what he supposes) a foundation or Argument whereon to build, but simply a *medium* or instrument whereby is begotten and brought forth that Faith which is of the operation of God. And therefore in vain does he dispute about the Primitive Christians believing, either because the Apostles so taught, or *Simon Magnus* so affirmed; for it was not because, but by the Preaching, whether of *Paul*, or *Apollos*, that they did believe; *We have not dominion over your Faith*, 2 Cor. 1. 24. *Who then is Paul? or who is Apollos? but Ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man*, 1 Cor. 3. 5. The



The Captains inadvertency, or imprudence is as evident

*First*, In that he never calls to mind, that Priests and Jesuites pass usually under the Notion of Lay Gentlemen, and great Folks Cousins: Trusts, *Eve* like, to his own skill, and never makes known either his doubts, or the Gentlemans objections to any of the Protestant Ministers. He borrows, it's true, a certain deal of Popish Books; *The Question of Questions*, *Novelty repressed*, *Fiat Lux*, *Infidelity unmasked*, or a confutation of a Book published by Mr. William Chillingworth, but never inquires for Mr. William Chillingworth's own Book, nor Dr. Hammonds answer to *Infidelity Unmasked*, in his vindication of the Lord Falkland. He never sends to Dr. Owen for his animadversions on *Fiat Lux*, nor adviseth with Mr. Baxter about *Novelty suppress*: Had he consulted with these Ministers of ours, and told us wherein they failed in the answering either these Books, or the Lay Gentlemans Objections, it might have been of some moment, have startled perhaps some of the Nonconformists; but to make a stirr

stir and a story, how mildly, how profoundly the Lay Gentleman objected; and then how extreamly troubled, how strangely the Horse-Captain was gravelled, argues nothing, save the Gentlemans cunning craftiness, and the Captains dastardly weakness: the cause no more concerned, than if they had never had meeting.

*Secondly*, He never considered that the Gentleman was altogether for asking questions, *Robert* never proposes any; for if, when the Captain was gravelled, and could not certainly prove the truth of Christianity from his own Fanatick Principles, he had put the Gentleman to it to have proved Christianity certainly true from the Popish, a hundred to one, but they had both proved Heathens; the one being no more able to establish it by Miracles upon the infallibility of the Roman Church, than the other by sense and feeling upon the Spirits Testimony: the man now knows and finds this to be true enough; and therefore in the conclusion doth he present us with six queries, conjures his old Brethren to answer them, and withal, warily provides.

vides that they shall not ask him any question at all; but first ascertain what they would establish: for says he Page 85. *Who knows not, if a Man will give himself scope to be bold, he may raise Arguments against the belief of the Trinity, or any other Mystery of Faith, that will puzzle learned Men to answer; a piece of cunning and evasion, I could wish all our weaker sort of Protestants to take special notice of.*

*Thirdly,* The man unadvisedly all along confounds endeavours to fix, and find in the same subject, the Rule, Judge and Guide of Faith; whereas these three are in their respective Natures, Uses, Ends distinct, and scarcely possible to be subjected in the same thing or person. The Scripture may be a Rule certain and stable as *Bellarmino*, and yet no Judge. Reason may be a judge, or rather that whereby every man is to judge for himself, as *Chillingworth*, and yet no Rule. The spirit may be Guide, to direct, draw and lead us into all truth, and yet neither rule nor judge, The Church by her Ministry may be subservient to the spirit in leading, helpful to us in finding out, applying of,

of, and judging according to the Rule, and yet the Church it self be neither Rule, Judge, nor Guide; nor will now that grand Sophism [the Spirit is not, Reason is not, the Scripture is not, the Judge, Rule and Guide, and therefore the Church is] be of any force: for never to take notice, that it founds an affirmative conclusion upon negative premisses; it supposes that some Presbyterians, Independents, &c. should hold, the Spirit alone, some Reason, some the Scripture, each exclusive of the Ministry of the Church, to be the Rule, Judge, and Guide of Faith; whenas all they joyntly, in this business, joyn all these together, and look up unto God, according to his command and promise, for his Holy spirit in the Churches Ministry, throughly to direct their understandings in judging of things according to the written Rule.

*Fourthly,* The man never perceives that his own vain ratiocinations and needless concessions are the sole ground that is given for him to bottom his belief upon; a strong fancy he has, and need on, for his Faith's no stronger. To evince this I

shall

shall instance in these six positions laid down and supposed as the Basis of his whole discourse. *First*, Faith is an infallible assent of the understanding, submitting it self obediently to believe the Revelations of God. *Secondly*, There must be some means appointed of God, by which we may know this one true Faith from all false opinions. *Thirdly*, These means must be infallible. *Fourthly*, The understanding must submit to these means under pain of Damnation. *Fifthly*, Two men of two different faiths or beliefs cannot be saved. *Sixthly*, Ignorant people by such reasonable diligence as is very tolerable to Humane frailty, and yet possible for them, may come to the knowledge (wisely done to leave out certain) of these means. And now if you ask what foundation he has whereupon to ground his belief of these assertions, he'll tell you, I gathered them from the true interpretation of certain Texts of Scripture. And if you ask further, how he knows that interpretation to be true? Has he Divine Revelation for it? According to the tenour of his own first position,

position: Has he the unanimous consent of the Fathers for it? Or does he certainly know, beyond all possibility of being mistaken, that the Church in all Ages hath, and the present Church now doth give that interpretation accordingly as is decreed by the Council of Trent? No, but from hence I thought (says he) it did very naturally follow: Firstly, Secondly, and Thirdly, &c. And yet that it may appear, he only says, could not possibly think, any such a thing, observe from that exhortation, *Hab. 10. 23. Let us hold fast the profession of our Hope* (so in their own Authentick Translation) *underlining*; does he infer, Faith is an infallible assent of our understanding: and because the latter part of the verse, *for he is faithful that hath promised*, founded the confidence, there spoken of, upon the promise of Grace; and the former Verse fixed faith with its full assurance upon the High Priest Jesus alone. The man silly passeth over both, and leaves the other part of his proposition (*obediently submitting, &c.*) destitute of any proof. From 2 Cor. 10. 5. *bring-*  
ing



ing into Captivity every thought to the Obedience of Christ; he infers, the understanding must submit, not dispute: all be Damned that disobey the Authority of the Church; and adds withal, that saving faith is seated in the understanding, as if Paul had been mistaken when he said, *with the heart man believeth unto Righteousness*, Rom. 10. 10. or as if he himself knew not what he had done in putting [*obediently submitting*] into the definition of faith, sith all conclude, obedience and disobedience to be subjected in the will. From Eph. 4. 5. *there is but one Faith*, respect had to the personal object in whom, the Lord Jesus; He concludes, that two men of differing faiths Dogmatical, or that believe two contrary opinions cannot be saved; nor is he ashamed, from Isaiah 35. 8. plainly pointing at Christ, the new and living way, first to take out, *and the unclean shall not pass over it*, as incoherent, because their unholy Mother admits of such for her children; and then infers, that ignorant people by reasonable diligence, may come to the knowledge of those means, about which yet their learned men

men to this very day could never be agreed. Nor can he himself tell, when it comes to the pinch, how those means should be certainly manifest, save by miracles, of which we ignorant folk may often hear, but never come to the knowledge of: however, that I most admire at, is, That the man designing to prove, that true acceptable faith consists in believing as the Church believes, a believing that the Roman Church is infallible, should quote *Heb. 11. 6.* that holds out the faith, *without which it is impossible to please God*, to be a believing; not that the Church, but that God himself is so; *he that comes to God, must believe that he is, &c.* And further, that he should stand hasting and passing, and proving by halves, there must be some means appointed by God, by which men may know, &c. those means must be infallible, the understanding must submit to those means under pain of damnation; when the very Text quoted, *Mark. 16. 16.* shews plainly, that there be means, infallible means, and which be the means appointed, whereby

whereby true faith both is begotten,  
 and may be known from all false  
 opinions, and unto which all ~~that~~  
 heartily submit shall be saved, and  
 those that do not, shall be damned:  
 and lest you should mistake in read-  
 ing, the means be, the word of truth,  
 the Gospel Preached though by the  
 mouth of never so weak a Minister.  
*Go into all the World, and Preach the  
 Gospel unto every Creature; He that be-  
 lieveth and is Baptized shall be saved,  
 and he that believeth not shall be dam-  
 ned:* nor yet is it unworthy of re-  
 mark, 1. That means in general is  
 here all along found in the premis-  
 ses, and Authority in speciall put  
 after into the conclusion: there must  
 be, there is an infallible Means, and  
 therefore there is, there must be an in-  
 fallible Authority. And 2. That the  
 man seriously endeavours to found the  
 very foundation of his own faith upon  
 Scriptures, dark Scriptures privately  
 interpreted, howbeit the main scope  
 of his Book is to evince that faith,  
 true faith, neither first nor last,  
 can or ought to be founded there-  
 upon.

*A Genere  
 ad speciem  
 affirmat.  
 non valet  
 Argumen-  
 tum.*

B

That

Pag. 4.

That self-interest had a hand in the Captains overturning, seems more than probable; because, First, The Captain in the late Wars (as his Book relates) had run through the several forms of Religion, *Presbyterian, Independent, Anabaptist, &c.* and yet never, that we read of, lost his preferment upon any Turn, nor missed of it for want of timely turning; and sith so, the man might easily foresee, that such a notorious Jugler was never like to be trusted at the Kings Court: Best for him now at last to turn Papist, do the Jesuits some signal service, declare against his old friends, and their old enemies, the Nonconformists, and perhaps by that wile he might in the Queens Chapel come in time to get advancement. For,

*Secondly*, If seditions, Schisms, Heresies amongst Protestants, and discourses with Lay-Gentlemen in their quarters could have overturned the faith of Captains, never so like to have been done as during the late distractions; but for all that while, though we heard of some Popish Champions turning Sectaries, yet of  
no

no Sectarian Captain that became a Romanist.

*Thirdly*, The mans carriage all along makes manifest, that the selfish wisdom of the Old wily Serpent is yet remaining with him : he knows well enough that there's nothing more inconsistent with Papal government than the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy ; nor any thing more opposite to Popish Doctrine, than the 39 Articles: and yet can he neither be content to say ill, nor say nothing of our English Episcopacy ; but upon occasion is bowing down himself unto it, in the days of yore ; doubtless he got to be a Captain by praying and preaching like some sort of a Saint, and now time after time, is crying up himself for a good Subject, leaves the Episcopal Church out of his Catalogue of Sects, and pretends a great deal of Reverence to any profession that shall be established by Law.

But above all, the just judgment of God is most remarkable in sending him and such like, strong delusion, *that they should believe a lie, and that because they received not the love of*

*the truth, that they might be saved, but had pleasure in unrighteousness; nor need I divine the no love this man had to the truth; and the great pleasure he always had and now hath in unrighteousness is notoriously manifest by his First, Blaspheming the Spirit; Secondly, Abusing Reason; Thirdly, Vilifying the Scriptures; Fourthly, Wronging the Church Catholick; Fifthly, Belying Protestants; Sixthly, Dissembling the Tenets of the Papists.*

The spirit is blasphemed, 1. by giving that glory of Infallibility, which is peculiar to the Holy Ghost, to the organs or instruments by which he is pleased to reveal the mind of God. Men speaking from deliberation use free-will, may speak or not speak, speak truth or falsehood, and consequently for that time cannot but be fallible. And when men speak divinely, yet not deliberately, it is not properly they that speak, but the Holy Ghost that speaketh in them. *The word of the Lord came to me, saying. The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. And in this case 'tis the word spoken that is infallible, and not they that speak*



speak it. It were not proper for such  
 on that account to say, *It seemeth*  
*good to the Holy Ghost, and to us;*  
 but, not we, but the Holy Ghost, not  
*I, but the Lord:* and hence the eternal  
 God is said internally to demonstrate  
 by his spirit, and externally to confirm  
 by miracles, not the infallibility of  
 the organ through which he speaks,  
 but the infallible truth of the word  
 that is spoken. *And they went forth every*  
*where, the Lord working with them, and*  
*confirming the word with signs following,*  
 Mark 16. 20. 2. The spirit expressly,  
 1 John 4. 2, 3. makes the Doctrine  
 Preached the Rule, according to  
 which we are to try the spirits; *Here-*  
*by know we the spirit of God: Every spirit*  
*that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in*  
*the flesh, is of God: and every spirit that*  
*confesseth not, &c.* And yet does the  
 man wittingly conceal that, and  
 wrests verse 6. to the making of the  
 hearing of the Apostle, the only rule of  
 trying of spirits, without regard had to  
 their Doctrine. Nor does he stick  
 here, but supposing [ *we* ] verse 6.  
 to denote the same persons as [ *ye* ]  
 verse 4. confidently concludes,  
 hearing of Christs Apostles then was,

B 3                      therefore

therefore hearing Popish Priests now is, the only rule. The Apostle doubtless saw this mystery of iniquity beginning then to work ; and therefore leaves us a general Rule without any exception. 2 Joh. c. *Whoſoever tranſgreſſeth and abideth not in the doctrine of Chriſt, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Chriſt, he hath the Father and the Son. If there come any to you, and bringeth not this doctrine, receive him not into the Houſe, neither bid him God ſpeed.* 3. The man reviles the Saints, that have received the Holy anointing, tells how they would have the world believe that they have the ſpirit, without bringing Reason, Evidence, Teſtimony or Authority to evince it: whenas yet if either Reason, Evidence, Teſtimony, or Authority may be regarded, *the Tree is known by its fruits,* and their having the ſpirit, manifeſt by *Love, Joy, Peace, Long-ſuffering, Gentleneſs, Goodneſs, Faith, Meekneſs, Temperance.* Gal. 5. 22. They confeſs that *Jeſus is come in the Fleſh,* as aforeſaid, and, *that Jeſus is the Lord,* which no man can, *but by the Holy Ghoſt,* 1 Cor. 12. 3. Nor need he trouble himſelf

Page 21. with telling, that if it be the ſpirit  
of

of God they have, he is infallible in his teaching, and both they and all the world are obliged under pain of Damnation to believe what he delivers as matter of faith, to be true. For 1. Though they say they have the spirit of God, and that he is infallible in his teaching, yet they do not say, Pope-like, that they are thereby made infallible in theirs. He teacheth all of them the whole truth as it is in Jesus, *for they shall all know me from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith the Lord,* Jer. 31. 34. but teaches not any, all the points of Doctrine that be true, *for we know in part, and prophesie in part,* 1 Cor. 13. 9. *according to the measure of the gift of Christ,* Eph. 4. 7. 2. Both they and all the world are obliged under pain of Damnation to believe whatsoever God says is true, and so many as know that there is an Holy Ghost, are obliged in like manner to believe whatsoever shall be delivered by that promised spirit of truth. But as to the particulars he shall deliver, the case is different. The Saints are severally bound to believe whatsoever he shall convincingly

ingly deliver to any of them ; and the world bound to believe whatsoever he shall convincingly deliver to the World : *when he comes he shall convince*, Joh. 16. 8. Nor yet, 3. do they look ( as some would seem to suppose ) that others should believe what they say, to be true , either because they say or prove that they have the Spirit, whether of Adoption or Prophecy , but because when and so far as that same Spirit by undeniable reasons and testimonies shall make manifest in their consciences the truth of what they do assert : *by the manifestation of the truth , commending our selves to every mans conscience in the sight of God*, 2 Cor. 4. 2.

Reason is a means whereby we come to know what is, not, what ought to be revealed ; a means whereby we judge of things Divine according to the Rule , though yet it be not , may not be called the Rule according to which we are to judge: Reason I say that is thus useful, and ought to be thus limited , the man one while enslaves , and then anon sets it up for an absolute Lord.

Lord. When reason comes to argue against the Churches Infallibility, then must it Vassal-like submit, not dispute, not wait for an effectual conviction according to Christs promise and procedure, *And when he is come, he shall convince, &c.* but yield forthwith to what the Church says; nay, to whatsoever an ignorant English Romish Priest can have the confidence to say, their Church hath sufficiently proposed; or if Reason offer to produce arguments to prove the truth of Christianity, and evince the Scripture to be the word of God, urge Miracles, Universal-Tradition, conclude from Topicks internal, external, in other cases cogent and demonstrative, yet then Reason is fallible, subject to error, a private spirit, a fancy, can make things at best appear no more than probable; *Jews, Turks and Pagans* may be as fully perswaded, and upon as good rational grounds of the truth of their Religion, as we can of ours. But now if reason will be corrupted, become an Advocate for *Rome*, her very sophisms shall be cryed up as sufficient grounds for us to found our faith

B 5 upon.

upon. God will not be defective in necessities, and therefore there must be an infallible, visible Judge. Christ is the only absolute, independent head of the Church, but may, and therefore hath appointed a dependent head derived from him. It is most rational in business of civil concernment, to rely on a Council of wise and learned men: And therefore in things spiritual, which God usually hides from the wise and prudent, and the natural man receives not, we ought to rely on a Council of Popish Prelates. The Eunuch could not understand the Prophecy of *Isaiah*, till ministerially expounded by *Philip* the Deacon: And therefore cannot we understand that Text though already expounded; no nor any other till Authoritatively interpreted by the Roman Church. The Apostles, Elders, and Brethren when sent to, sent out a Temporary Decree about things indifferent, made then by circumstances in some places antecedently necessary, binding only in those places, and pressed with an [if] ye do these things, ye do well. And therefore the Cardinals, Bishops



Bishops and Abbots may and ought  
 to frame an everlasting Law about  
 points of Doctrine, make that neces-  
 sary for all men, which God never  
 made necessary for any, and press it  
 under the dread of an Anathema, or  
 pain of Eternal damnation: Nay,  
 though God say, *to the Law and to the  
 Testimony, the Law of the Lord is perfect,  
 the Scripture able not only to make wise  
 to Salvation, but so far profitable, that  
 the man of God, the Pastor, may be  
 thoroughly furnished unto every good  
 work*; yet if Reason can find any  
 thing to say against the Scripture's  
 being a Rule, it shall be heard. The  
 Scripture then must not be a  
 Rule, and why? Has God any where  
 contradicted himself, and said it must  
 not? Has he any where appointed  
 another? No, but here's a first rea-  
 son, and a second reason, and a  
 third reason, &c. and therefore it  
 must be none, and yet the sum of all  
 no more than this; Some Christians  
 are dim-sighted, some perverse; many  
 are carnal, walk as men, will not be  
 ruled; and therefore the Scripture is  
 not the Rule, Ruler sure he would  
 have said; some people are contenti-  
 ous

*Hominem  
 Dei vocat  
 Doctorem  
 & Episco-  
 pum, ut  
 dixi Ep.  
 I. C. 6. ver.  
 II. Cor-  
 nel. a  
 Lapide*



ous Lawyers, corrupt, and differ in their opinions, and therefore the Law of the Land is not what it is; *scilicet*, the Law of the Land according to which controversies may and ought to be decided: and now

The Church, before, under, and since the Law, will she, nill she, must always have been, and for ever be, this Rule; whenas yet it is evident that the Word was a rule both to *Adam* and *Eve* before the Church had Being, *it shall bruise thy head*, Genes. 3. 15. God said to *Abraham*, *so shall thy seed be*; and he believed in the Lord, &c. Gen. 15. 5, 6. Nor was it written for his sake alone, but for us also, Rom. 4. 23, 24. Ye shall not add to the word I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, was given in charge to the Church of the *Jews*, Deut. 4. 2. And if any man (says the Apostle) Preach unto you any other Gospel than that ye have received, let him be accursed, Gal. 1. 9. These are written, that ye might believe that *Jesus* is the *Christ* the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name, Joh. 20. 31.

Nor

Nor yet is it the question, whether the Scripture accidentally taken, or the Word as written; but whether the Scripture taken Essentially, or the mind of God communicated at sundry times, and in divers manners

to and by the Prophets, Preached by the Apostles, and now committed and conveyed down to us by Sacred writing, always hath, is, & ought to be owned for the rule of Faith: or whether indeed (because it seems you long to have the question

stated with that advantage) even in *Abrahams* and the Apostles times, others as well as *Sarah*, Gen. 21. 10. and the *Beraans*, Act. 17. 11. might not have urged, demanded, and without the just controul of any then visible authority, have believed and acted according to the prescript of that Rule, your own instances, Page 53. of extraordinary actions done, and Commands given by Gods directions, by the mouths of several particular

*Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis cognovimus, quam per eos per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos, quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postremo vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt: fundamentum & columnam fidei nostræ futurum nobis.*  
Iren. L. 3. c. 1.

ticular Prophets, submitted to (as you say) without further enquiry, do plainly evince as much, and also intimate that the will or word of God, which way soever it be made known, whether immediately or mediately; whether by Prophecy, Tradition or Writing, is and always has been the supream Rule both of Faith and Practice; and its adequation, as to matters of Faith, as now contained in, and expressed by the Scripture, shall be after cleared. However the Church (as your own 7. S. well observes) being a Congregation of the faithful, must needs presuppose the notion of faithful, faithful, the notion of Faith, Faith, of the rule of Faith, an evident argument that the Church is and ought to be regulated in believing; and consequently she her self cannot be the rule of belief, nor any more, save as the same man says of Fathers, Doctors, and great Scholars, and might as well have said the same of Tradition too, a means to bring others to the knowledge of it. But,

Sure footing for  
Christianity. page 18.  
20.

Secondly,

*Secondly*, The man will needs fear authority in the Holy Catholick Church, notwithstanding that authority Supream, Magisterial, formally as well as radically is seated in Christ. *All authority is given to me*, Matt. 28. 18. Nor is the Church the subject, but the object of the Ministerial Power, *He gave some Apostles, some Pastors, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ*, Eph. 4. 11, 12. God hath set some in the Church, First, Apostles, 1 Cor. 12. 18. and by the way, [some] in the Church, not [one over] the Church; for the whole, respect had to its organical frame, form, or Government, is divided into several Churches, several Congregations, if you will, as well as the world into several Kingdoms. *To the angel of the Church of Ephesus*, Rev. 2. 1. *We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God*, 1 Cor. 11. 16. Nor did Paul treating, 1 Cor. 12. concerning spiritual gifts, relate to a chief in governing, but the choicest for Prophefying, whea

when he said, *nor again, the Head to the Feet, I have no need of you.*

*Thirdly,* Although the Bishops of Rome, in that very thing (as Gregory well notes) forerunners of Antichrist, did frequently challenge an Universal Jurisdiction; yet was it never owned, nor submitted to by the Catholick Church, as it is evident from S. Cyprian, opposing Stephanus, Irenaus reproving of Victor, Jerom's *Eugubium*, and the sixth Council of Carthage, in which was Augustin, and Aurelianus; as also from the Acts of three of the four first General Councils, Nice, Constantinople and Chalcedon.

*Fourthly,* The man in the Close, restrains the Church Catholick to a Church of one denomination called the Roman, meaning though thereby, not what Paul meant, the *Saints at Rome*, Rom. 1. 7. but all that vastly extended community of Christians which live in communion with, and in subjection to, the Bishop of Rome, as to their supream Pastor, and Governour on Earth in all things appertaining unto faith, next under Christ,

Christ, when as yet the Arguments,  
 and Texts all along produced  
 seemingly militate for the infallibi-  
 lity of the Church; not this or that  
 Church though never so vastly ex-  
 tended; and above all, not for the  
 old Roman (and therefore he did  
 wisely to frame a new one) for it's  
 expressly declared fallible. *Rom. 11.*  
*22.* And yet again, *pag. 61.* we are  
 presented with a General Council  
 of Prelates as this Church, this in-  
 fallible Rule, which can by no means  
 be identified with all that vastly  
 extended community, &c. And yet  
 let him take which he will, he'll be  
 still at a loss. For such an Assem-  
 bly of Prelates is not now in being, nor  
 like to be, nor has there been any such  
 for a Century of years last past: And  
 as for all the Christians of that vast  
 community, they are to be judged,  
 ruled, guided, and consequently not  
 the Rule, Judge and Guide: If  
 exempted from error personal, it were  
 of well. Judicial infallibility concerns  
 not them. In the beginning he's for  
 submission to the Holy Catholick  
 Church, and now as if by [Holy Ca-  
 tholick Church] he did not mean the  
 Holy



when he said, nor again, the Head to the Feet, I have no need of you.

Thirdly, Although the Bishops of Rome, in that very thing (as Gregory well notes) forerunners of Antichrist, did frequently challenge an Universal Jurisdiction; yet was it never owned, nor submitted to by the Catholick Church, as it is evident from S. Cyprian, opposing *Stephanus*, *Irenaeus* reproving of *Victor*, *Jerom's* *Eugubium*, and the sixth Council of *Garthage*, in which was *Augustin*, and *Aurelius*; as also from the Acts of three of the four first General Councils, *Nice*, *Constantinople* and *Chalcedon*.

Fourthly, The man in the Close, restrains the Church Catholick to a Church of one denomination called the Roman, meaning though thereby, not what *Paul* meant, the *Saints at Rome*, Rom. 1. 7. but all that vastly extended community of Christians which live in communion with, and in subjection to, the Bishop of Rome, as to their supream Pastor, and Governour on Earth in all things appertaining unto faith, next under Christ,

Christ, when as yet the Arguments, and Texts all along produced seemingly militate for the infallibility of the Church; not this or that Church though never so vastly extended; and above all, not for the old Roman (and therefore he did wisely to frame a new one) for it's expressly declared fallible, *Rom. 11. 22.* And yet again, *pag. 61.* we are presented with a General Council of Prelates as this Church, this infallible Rule, which can by no means be identified with all that vastly extended community, &c. And yet let him take which he will, he'll be still at a loss. For such an Assembly of Prelates is not now in being, nor like to be, nor has there been any such for a Century of years last past: And as for all the Christians of that vast community, they are to be judged, ruled, guided, and consequently not the Rule, Judge and Guide: If exempted from error personal, it were well. Judicial infallibility concerns not them. In the beginning he's for submission to the Holy Catholick Church, and now as if by [Holy Catholick Church] he did not mean the Holy

*Rag.* 72.

Holy Catholick Church his Mother; nor any thing else save the Pope his Father, he's for submission and obedience to the Bishop of *Rome*. The matter and marvel is, that the man has been tewing and tugging and troubling himself and us all this while, about an universal infallible visible Authoritative Church, and now in the issue can neither tell, who, where, or what it is. However sith the Church is such an one, which is truly appointed by God to be this infallible Judge, must needs (as he saith) have this condition, that she doth own her infallibility; It is incumbent upon the Captain in the first place to make it out, that the present Roman visible Church doth plainly own her infallibility, (for his owning, and inferences we shall not regard,) or else confess, that in his own account she is not the Church he tells of, truly appointed of God to be this infallible Judge; nor let him thus think to put us off and say, unless he evidently prove that she does that by the Pope her mouth: for the Pope will not be content to be the Churches, but Christs own mouth and

er; and Vicar, *Peter's* successor, the Rock upon which the Church is built, at least next unto Christ.

Of Protestants he saith, All that I *Pag. 18.*  
 ever met with seemed to grant, There must be a way or Rule, there must be a means appointed, there must be a Governing Power to judge and decide all doubts, and teach us the true way to Heaven with certainty; but who this Judge is, that is the difficulty. Whenas i. though Protestants generally conclude, that the Scripture is the rule according to which every Christian may and ought to judge of doubts with a judgment of discretion; and Pastors joyntly or severally with a judgment of direction: Yet none affirm that any who on Earth is, or can be, either Rule or Judge, much less both Rule and Judge Infallible, Universal, Prætorial, such as he (under the notion of his Governing Power) is at present seeking for. *Dr. Fern's ex- Pag. 60.*  
 pression [ indeed such a Judge and Empire in Christendom if to be had, would be a ready means to compose all differences, and to restore truth and Peace, ] comes next to any that he

Of the Infallibility  
of the  
Church of  
Rome,  
p. 69. 19.

Against  
Knot, part  
1. c. 2. pag.  
84.

he can pitch upon, and yet has Dr. *Fern* neither wish nor word of any for  
whosoever being a Rule, nor is he God  
so sawcy as to say there *must* be a noo  
Judge or Umpire appointed. But bus  
such a Judge or Umpire would, if to idg  
be had, be a ready, neither the best nou  
nor the only means to compose her  
all differences. 2. Sith in those and  
things in which before a General sing  
Council hath defined, it is lawful to H  
hold either way, and damnable to do with  
so after. The Lord *Falkland* desire Gov  
to know how it agreeth with the ble  
Charity of the Church to define any ry  
thing, and so bestow upon the De ist  
vil one path more for us to walk in one t  
to him. And although, sayes *Chilve*  
*lingworth*, we wish heartily that all con sum  
troversies were ended, as we do that at  
all sin were abolished; yet have we each  
little hope of the one, or of the oth  
ther, till the World be ended: in the way,  
mean while think it best to content at S  
our selves with, and perswade others to g  
to, an unity of charity and mutua he n  
toleration, seeing God hath autho tabl  
rised no man to force all to the un  
ty of opinion. Neither do we thin  
it fit to argue thus: To us it seem  
cor

convenient there should be one Judge  
 for the whole world; therefore  
 God hath appointed one: but more  
 modest and more reasonable to collect  
 But, God hath appointed no such  
 Judge of controversies; therefore  
 enough to us it seems convenient  
 there should be one, yet it is not so.  
 and yet, 3. We who can dis-  
 tinguish betwixt the scriptural way  
 to Heaven, and the Churches Rule of  
 Faith; betwixt an external infallible  
 Governour, and an internal infal-  
 lible Teacher; betwixt an unneces-  
 sary decision of all doubts, and a full  
 satisfaction of the heart about the  
 one thing needful: We I say, which  
 have learned thus to distinguish, do  
 humbly and thankfully acknowledge  
 that there is a means appointed to  
 teach us the true way to Heaven  
 with certainty. Jesus is the true  
 way, the only way to Heaven; and  
 that Spirit which he hath promised,  
 and gives in the Gospel ministry, is  
 the means appointed to teach and  
 establish us in that way with certain-  
 ty. *If I depart, I will send him unto  
 you, and when he is come, he shall con-  
 firm the world of sin, because they be-  
 lieve*



lieve not in me : They shall be all taught of God, all shall know me, &c. In whom, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise, Eph. 1. 13. And now you, instead of reviling such Christians as humbly own their having received the anointing, or troubling your self and others with that monstrous notion of an universal infallible governing Church, should examine your self whether you have been so convinced, taught and sealed by that spirit through hearing the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation : received ye the spirit by the hearing of Faith ? Gal. 3. 2.

Pag. 33. Secondly, It is impossible for any one of these parties (meaning Independents, Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Fifth-monarchy men, Quakers,) which I must now crave leave to call Sects) with reason to censure or condemn any of the others, although never so different from themselves, even in points by them esteemed fundamental, since each of them have their uncontrollable Plea for themselves, that their faith is in every respect conformable to what they understand

understand to be the true sense and meaning of the Scriptures, which they agree to be the sole and only Rule and Judge. Nay, which of these parties can deny the others the Title of Protestants, or convince them of Heresie? Since to be a Protestant no more is required (or if it be I would gladly know what it is) than to admit the Scriptures interpreted according to their best understanding and Conscience, to be the sole and only rule of Faith, and Judge of Controversies. Is not he that professeth and followeth this principle, allowed by all to be a perfect good Protestant, though never so much differing in Faith from others who make the same profession.

The *Quakers*, because your Allies in the grand point of justification, and an uncharitable sentencing of all, save their own Sect, shall for me stand or fall to their own Master; but for the rest that you mention, I say that you suppose what you cannot prove, *scilicet*, that they differ in points that be, or are esteemed by them to be fundamental. Do they not all own the Creed called the Apostles, and all

all conclude, that therein be contained all the fundamental points at least? Nay, do they not all own the doctrinal part of the 39 Articles, inasmuch that you who would seem to revere the Doctrine established by Law, dare not say they be Hereticks, but are fain to crave leave to call them Sects.

*Secondly*, It's true, they all agree, the Scripture to be the sole and only Rule, and yet mean the Scripture taken in the sense intended by God, not as privately interpreted by any of them: nor is their faith or present perswasion according to their grounds or pleadings, uncontroulable; sith what they hold in a supposed conformity with, or understand to be, the true sense and meaning of any Text, is humbly submitted unto what can be made out with greater evidence more nearly to accord with, or be the very sense and meaning intended by the Holy Ghost. *Apollos* was ready to yield to *Aquila* and *Priscilla*, Acts 18. 26. and they to you, or any else that shall expound unto them the way of God more perfectly. But,

*Thirdly*,

*Thirdly*, It matters not much whether these parties can or cannot deny to one another the title of Protestant, so they see ground for, and do allow to one another the name of Christian: Protestant is no more to us, than Papist to you, though yet you seem not well to know, either who or what is meant by Protestant. And therefore shall Mr. *Baxter* at your desire instruct you: A Protestant is a Christian that holdeth to the Holy Scripture, as the sufficient Rule of Faith and Holy living, and protesteth against Popery. Or if this like you not, take your own definition with some little amendment: A Protestant is a Christian, that professeth with S. *Augustin*, in those things which are laid down plainly in the Scriptures, all those things are found which appertain to faith and direction of life, and further admitteth of the Scripture where needing interpretation: as interpreted according to his best understanding and Conscience that he has, or in the use of lawful means may have: for the intricate Rule of what he, as such, ought to hold and practise. And yet, suppose

C

pose all that, and only that required to the Being of a Protestant, which you insert: The parties you tell of, may at that account convince of Heresie such amongst them as shall appear to be guilty of it; may they not use means by *opening, alledging and reasoning out of the Scripture*, according to *Act. 17. 2, 3.* better to inform and reclaim such a one? May they not do as the Lay gentleman did with you, and you now in writing this Epistle do with your old Brethren? or may they not mind him as Christ did the *Sadduces*? *ye err, not knowing the Scriptures.* *Matt. 22. 19.* and make such a like challenge as *Augustin* did to *Maximinus*. But now neither ought I to produce the *Nicene Council*, nor thou that of *Ariminum*, as going about to pre-  
 judge, neither am I detained by the Authority of this, nor thou of that. I set thing with thing, cause with cause, reason with reason, by authorities of Scriptures, not proper to either, but common witnesses to us both, and after apparent conviction, or stopping of the mouth by Scripture Testimony, that man will not relinquish  
 bu

*Aug. lib.  
 contra  
 Maxim. l. 2.  
 c. 14.*

but persist groundlessly to maintain his grossly erroneous Tenet, it is an evident sign that he does not indeed admit of Scriptures, interpreted according to his best understanding and conscience, to be the Rule, but obstinately adheres to the perverse wilful reasonings of his own fleshly mind, is not a Protestant according to the tenor of your own description; but one that is or ought to be rejected by them. And although I know well enough you have other means for condemning, and killing such you please to call Hereticks, yet am I to learn, what better means you have whereby to convince them of Heresie, or discern who they be.

*A man that is an Heretick, after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such, is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself.* Tit. 3. 10, 11. However you might have done well to have distinguished betwixt a Protestant, and a perfect good Protestant. He that professeth to follow this one principle, so diametrically opposite to the fundamentals of Popery, may perhaps be admitted by all, or most,



for a Protestant ; yet if he differ in points of faith, tradited by the four first General Councils, and commonly received by Christians, or to be of a vicious life, he is not, at least ought not to be, owned by any of them for a perfect good Protestant.

To elude these plain and evident Texts, *scilicet*, *Deuter.* 17. 8. *Matt.* 23. 2, 3. &c. brought to prove that the Church is the sole infallible Rule and Judge ) you were wont to say that they may have other interpretations, and therefore this is not the truth ; it is a question whether any Texts of Holy Scriptures, and consequently whether these Texts which speak so amply of the Church, are to be understood of the Church militant, and visible in this world, or of the Church triumphant. Ye are willing to agree, that so long as the Church of Christ teacheth conformable to Scriptures she is infallible. Whereas instead of thus saying, doubting or agreeing, we enquire,

*First*, To what purpose should you urge us to believe the infallibility of the Church, or any thing else, upon

upon Scripture grounds, when you tell us aforehand, that faith founded upon Scripture is not truly faith; for though we should grant what you suppose, (*scilicet*) that Christ and his Apostles did urge the *Jews* with Scriptures, meerly because of their incredulity; yet did they never tell them as you do us: Faith founded upon Scripture will avail you nothing. It is not that Divine Faith which God calls for at your hands Or if you yet say, that it is warrantable to believe the Church is infallible upon your urging; why not to believe Christ to be the Messias, or any other point of *Christian Doctrine*, upon our Ministers alledging of Scripture for it? But,

*Secondly*, Be these Texts plain and evident, or not? If not, why do you say they are? And if they be, these very Texts are a Rule, such as you seek for, whereby to judge of this Controversie, and consequently the Church is not the only Rule whereby Controversies are to be judged: But,

διὰ τοῦ  
 γὰρ καὶ  
 παρ' ὅτι  
 ἐμὲν  
 ἐν τῇ  
 κρίσει  
 τῶν γὰρ  
 φων.

*Thirdly*, The *Querendum* here is not whether we can shew with any assurance, that these Texts are capable of other interpretations; but whether you can demonstrate like as the Apostle used to do, *Act. 17. 3, 18.* these your own interpretations to be certainly true; do it, when you do it, by some infallible *medium*, and we shall be ready to believe what you say. But if you bring no proofs; and no other you have brought as yet, save your own private reasonings. Instead of believing the truth of your interpretations, we shall make bold to ask you, as you do yourself, what difference is there betwixt judging by your own reason, and judging by a Law to be interpreted by your own reason? This is to make the Scripture not Gods word, but the word of every private man. Though yet,

*Fourthly*, Had you not made a little bold with your own reason, and quite contrary, both to sense and honesty omitted *verse* the eight [between blood and blood, between Plea and Plea] and put down &c, instead of the eleventh verse (*nbi satis*  
 apte

apte sanctus *Moses Controversias ex-*  
*ortas in Populo Dei ex Lege Domini*  
*judicandas docet, Bellar. de verbo Dei*  
*lib. 1. cap. 2.* according to the sen-  
 tence of the Law, which they shall  
 teach thee ) it would have been evi-  
 dent from *Deut. 17.* That the Con-  
 troversies there spoken of, were limi-  
 ted to matters of strife betwixt party  
 and party, like those, *Mat. 18. 17.*  
 and the Judge in sentencing, to the  
 Rule of the Law, called *Moses Chair,*  
*Matt. 23. 2.* And consequently the  
 first Scripture you cite, which should  
 be the measure of the rest, partly  
 makes nothing for, in part makes  
 directly against your main conclusion.  
*Isaiab 35. 8.* hath been already; *Isaiab*  
*2. 4. Mat. 28. 20. Iohn 16. 12.* will  
 be hereafter spoken to; *Isaiab 43.*  
*3. 17. Isaiab 26. 2. 1. and Mat. 16. 9.*  
 confirm what we contend for, (*viz.*)  
 the whole Church of Gods Elect,  
 consisting of lively stones to be firm-  
 ly built upon that living stone, that  
 Rock Jesus Christ. *1 Pet. 2. 4, 5.*  
 And that the Royal seed, the Chil-  
 dren of God shall be all taught and  
 led by the Spirit of God, according  
 to *1 Cor. 8. 14 Iohn 6. 45. 1 Iohn 2.*

27. John 14. 16. relates only to such as are called out of the world : love him, and keep his commandments, as it is evident from verses 15. and 17. concerns neither the Pope nor his Cardinals, unless he or they be first proved the spiritual man intended, 1 Cor. 2. 15. and if Ephes. 4. 11. we may be allowed to leave out the Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, and read *he will give*, instead of *he gave*, which must be done ere that Text can have any shew of pertinency, it will respect all and singular Pastors and Teachers that be the gifts of Christ : *For the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.* Till we all come to an unity, not of opinion, form or points of Faith, as you use to word it, but into the unity of the faith, and knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ : That we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro (from confidence in one device, to a dependency upon another) and carried about with every empty wind of Doctrine, by the slight of men, and cunning

cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive. But speaking the truth in love, may grow up to him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom without mention or mediation of any other head, the whole body fitly joynted together, and compacted by that which every joynt supplyeth, according to the effectual working of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of it self in love: vers. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.

Nor is the last with which you flourish, of any more moment: for never to take notice that by Church, cannot there be meant *Roman*, or *General Council*: There is a Pillar for holding out Edicts, as well as a Pillar for holding up houses; there is a ground wherein men set Trees, sow Seed, as well as a ground whereon they erect buildings and recumb. The Church may be a Pillar to hold out the truth, and yet not a Pillar for you to rely on for all doctrines that be true. The Church may be that chosen ground, in which the Mystery of Godliness, Christ the truth is set, and sown, and yet no common ground given for you to found



your faith upon: Tares may spring up together with the good Seed: Truth held out, and yet error attend it: However the word in the Greek is *ισθια*, which properly signifies a Seat, and you know well how to let *Moses* Chair alone, and rely on him supposed to sit therein.

And now Sir, do you not stand astonished at your own impudence in thus imposing upon the Nonconformists; they do not, they need not limit these Texts to the Church triumphant, but tell you further,

*First*, That it will be hard for you to prove from Scripture, that the Church of God in this world (the Church you speak of, *Pag. 62.* which Christ redeemed with his blood) is a visible body Politick, different from that invisible Church which is Christ's mystical body: the Texts you cite *Acts 20. 28. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Eph. 4. 11. Col. 1. 24, 2, 5. Mat. 16. 18.* do import no such thing; for the four first distinguish betwixt the Church and the Overseers, Officers or Ministers thereof; seeming thereby to suppose

suppose that the Overseers, not as Overseers in their Politick capacity, but as believers, respect had to their spiritual Union, be truly members of the Church there mentioned; and for the fifth, if by *Rock* might be understood *Peter*, it would as to this business be of the same import. And if by *Rock* with the great St. *Augustin* we understand Christ (and so we ought and may, as is made appear by *Chamier*, the remoteness of the antecedent notwithstanding) that Text relates to the Church builded; the Church, which is Gods own workmanship, *Eph. 2. 10.* holding out that to be it, against which the Gates of Hell, whether sin or death, or the power or policy of spiritual Adversaries shall not prevail.

*Secondly*, Your Doctors usually blame us, for making two Churches, the one visible and the other invisible. And now you seem offended because we do not. However without regard to either, we affirm that the same Holy Catholick militant Church, is both visible and invisible; invisible, respect had to its union, and visible

*Augustin*  
*de verbis*  
*domini*  
*secund.*  
*Mat. Serm.*  
13.  
*Chamier*  
*Tom. 2. l.*  
*11. chap.*  
23.

visible respect had to its profession of Faith in Christ.

*Thirdly*, Yours I think do, and therefore sure should you in this case distinguish *inter Ecclesiam judicantem & docentem* betwixt the Church judging or defining, and the Church teaching, and have pleaded for that, not this to be infallible: as and for ours, though its true, they do affirm that the Church while teaching conformable to Scriptures, teacheth Doctrine infallibly true, yet do they never say that the Church, in any sense is, or ought to be denominated, infallible. No Sir, the Church hath other precious privileges, other benefits by these promises, and the Doctrine of Christ (as hath and shall be made appear) is and may be abundantly otherwise confirmed: you need not for fear of debasing the Church below the Devil, suppose her thus guilty of robbery, in making her self equal with God: Equal I say with God, because infallibility is not an effect or fruit like love, peace, but an essential attribute of the Holy Ghost,

no

no  
dic  
On  
Goo  
hov  
his  
wh  
Go  
vel  
you  
of  
fco  
Pri  
the  
wh  
nov  
the  
saic  
thin  
and  
you  
Rei  
or  
all  
fin  
bel  
in  
rec

no more communicable to, or predicable either of you or us, than Omnipresence or Omnipotency : *It's God alone that cannot lie,* Titus 1. 2. howbeit, in some cases others through his grace shall not.

*Fourthly,* The books of Scripture, *Pag. 83.* which you are pleased to accept as Gods written word, and Divine revelations, were first delivered unto you by Catholicks, and accepted of by your Ancestors, upon the score and word of Roman Catholicks, Priests and Monks, together with the same sense and interpretation, which the Roman Catholick Church now teacheth, and which was then confirmed by miracles as aforesaid.

*First,* You confess, *Querie the Pag. 84.* third, that there is a *Greek Church*, and an *Ethiopian Church* distinct from yours; and we can tell you out of *Reinerius cont. Heret. cap. 4. of Leonists or Lollards*, that were dispersed into all Countries, have continued ever since the Apostles, lived justly, and believed all the Articles contained in the Creed. Our Ancestors might receive the books of Scripture as Gods

Gods written word from Catholicks, and yet never be beholding to the Romanists for it. But be it so, that our Ancestors did as you say, what then? Did not the Primitive Christians receive the books of the Old Testament from the Jews, and yet rejected their Traditions, nay, disputed against the Jewish Traditions out of those very books. How ever,

*Secondly*, These books were not accepted as aforesaid, upon the score and word of the Roman Catholick Priests and Monks; for our Ancestors had the Priests and Monks word for the Apocrypha books, as well as for the Canonical, and yet did they reject those, and accept these because they found convincing reasons so to do.

*Thirdly*, True it is your Priests are sworn not to interpret Scripture against the sense, which the Holy Mother the Church hath held, and doth hold: but that they do so, or ever delivered unto our Ancestors any such an interpretation, much less any confirmed by Miracles, remains for you to prove, and is a fable

able we know nothing of; though  
yet,

*Fourthly*, If you, your Priests and Monks, or any body else can bring us to the certain knowledge thereof; or any other traditions so confirmed; we shall without further ado accept of, hold them as fast as we can, and in the mean while no little marvel that you knowing so well of such a sense, should spend time in troubling us with your own private glosses. Nor yet is the last, the least sign of a brazen forehead, the Apostate blushes not to tell to all the world that he has now learned to hate and abhor Rebellion and Treason as *Pag. 86.* much as Hell and Damnation, notwithstanding that,

*First*, The general approved Council of *Lateran* under *Innocent* the Third, decrees that if the Temporal Lord being required and admonished of the Church, shall neglect to purge his Country of Heretical defilements, the Pope may from thenceforth denounce his Vassals absolved from their fidelity, and may expose his Country to be seized on by Catholics, who rooting out the Hereticks may



may possess it without contradiction, and keep it in the purity of Faith. The Popish Bishops and Priests declare and swear, *extra hanc veram fidem Catholicam non est salus*, out of this true Catholick Faith there is no Salvation. The summ of all the Captain has learned, and would have us to learn, is to believe as the Church believes: and consequently is so far from having learned to hate and abhor rebellion, as Hell and Damnation; as he believes all such shall be damned to Hell, as do not hold it lawful (such procedure first had by the Church and Pope) to rise up in Rebellion against their Lord and King.

*Secondly*, The Oath of Allegiance was composed and imposed on purpose to distinguish the Loyal and disloyal Romanists, the Popes power of Excommunication not at all therein touched; no point of doctrine inserted, and yet is the Popish Religion so near allied to Rebellion, that it commands her Vassals rather to suffer death, than bind themselves by Oath to perform Allegiance

to

to their Lord and King ; though yet  
to say truth ,

*Thirdly*, The Papists in this deal  
more candidly than in any other  
thing that I know of : for should  
they take this Oath, as sometimes  
some of them in policy may do, it  
were no better than taking Gods name  
in vain. The Pope if antecedently he  
have not, may yet at pleasure absolve  
them from it ; they may this not-  
withstanding, be free to rebel, so  
soon as there is an opportunity, and  
all there be an opportunity, it is not  
likely that men so wise as they ,  
should ever offer to rebel. *Non licet  
Christianis, &c. says Bellarmine*, it is not  
lawful for Christians to tolerate a King  
that is an Heretick, if he endeavour  
to draw his Subjects into Heresie :  
And if you would know how Christi-  
an Papists in *England*, and some parts  
of *Germany* can be excused from neg-  
lect of duty ; *Dominicus Bannes* will  
tell you, because that generally they  
have not power to make such Wars  
against Princes, and great dangers are  
imminent over them, however an A-  
pology might easily be framed out  
of *Bellarmino* in the place fore-  
quoted,

quoted, *quod si Christiani olim non deposuerunt Neronem & Dioclesianum, & Julianum Apostatam & Valentem Arianum & similes, fuit quia deorant vires temporales Christianis*; If Christians in former times did not depose *Nero, Dioclesian, Julian the Apostate, and Valens the Arian* and such like, it was because temporal forces were wanting unto Christians: nor may it with any colour of Justice be pleaded, that *Bellarmino, Bannes, Mariana, Suarez, &c.* be but private Doctors, unless it be firstly made appear that the Roman Church might, and has legally reversed the foresaid *Lactonian Decree*, and anathematized the persons and opinions of these and such like as Heretical; however, Captain Robert carries it throughout like a man that is indeed an Heretick: for while a Protestant, he did act as a rebellious Traytor, and now being turn'd Papist will needs profess himself a Loyal Subject, both in their several times apparently against his own principles.

*The sixth reason against the Scriptures being a Rule, examined.*

**T**He sixth reason I meet with, was whatsoever is a sole and sufficient rule, must be plain and clear in all necessary points, at least, which relate unto faith, or the Means by which salvation is to be had, which the Scripture is not; and above all things it must not contradict it self, which the Scripture seems to do. To prove this, I shall give some few instances, which I think can never be infringed. Pag. 42.

The man comes here home to the point, waves his impertinent sophistical jumbling in of Judge and Guide, and most industriously indeavours to prove from the Scriptures deficiency and obscurity, that it is not the sole sufficient Rule, nor is it any marvel that we find him now so serious and earnest; for if this argument fail,

fail, all his other seven Antiscriptural reasons come to nothing with it : for though *Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, &c.* should disagree in matters of Faith, raise different senses to serve their several interests, cannot all of them understand, and some of them do desperately wrest several places to their own destruction, the Scripture supposed plain and clear in all necessary points, the fault and folly is their own. The Scripture all this notwithstanding, may and does still remain as it was, a sole sufficient Rule; or if some Books be lost, all Copies corrupted, and several Texts mistranslated, yet what's this to the purpose, while we can and shall evince, that the Books we at present have, are so intire, the Copies so pure, and the Translations so true, that all points necessary at least be therein plain and clear; nor will it avail to tell us of the Primitive Christians consulting with the Apostles, and that it is all one to judge by our own reason, and by a Law to be interpreted by our own reason : For we might suppose the Apostles with all their Authority

Authority now in being, go and consult with them, or in their absence with the Pastors of the several Churches as the great Moderators of all controversies, and yet the Scriptures if plain and clear still remain a sole sufficient Rule, according to which the controversies might and ought to be decided: Nor need we in this case be troubled with interpreting of Scriptures according to our own reason, sith 'tis supposed, and shall be proved, that the Scripture is so clear in all necessary points, that it needs no interpretation, though yet you may take notice by the way, that to judge by our own reason as the only rule, is not the same with judging by a Law to be interpreted by our own reason as one special means: your Argument would perhaps strike at that; but this is all that in any case we practise and so do; because Christ bids us *search the Scriptures*, and the Apostle adds, *judge ye what I say*, comparing spiritual things with spiritual; however, sith the faith or means by which salvation is to be had, is a believing on Christ  
the



the foundation, as hath been said, not a believing of just so many as you or others are pleased to call fundamental points: If the Scriptures be plain and clear, as without peradventure they are in their testifying of him according to *Joh. 5. 40.* they are plain and clear in what necessarily relates to Faith, or the means by which Salvation is to be had according to *John 20. 31.* and consequently what ever becomes of all the other, whether necessary or unnecessary points, may be a sole sufficient Rule according to the tendency of this your present discourse, the seeming contradictions shall after your infrangible instances, come now to be discussed.

*Pag. 42.* That they are not plain and clear, as aforesaid, consider all Christians generally (except some few) do agree that the Sacraments of the Gospel are necessary in order to Salvation. Now as to these, the Scriptures are so far from being clear that they do not so much as denominate what a Sacrament is, how many Christ ordained, or whether there be any Sacrament or not.

*First,*

*First*, All Christians may agree that the Sacraments are necessary, and yet they not be so; for it's Christs saying that they are, not at all the Christians agreeing, that can make them necessary. Did not all Christians generally agree for six hundred years together, that the Eucharist was necessary for Infants, and yet now the Church concludeth otherwise. But 2. it is here granted that some Christians deny the Sacraments of the Gospel to be necessary, and if some may be Christians and yet deny the necessity of Sacraments, it's an argument sufficient that they are not necessary. Nor indeed does the man assert that Sacraments be simply necessary, but qualifies it with, in order to Salvation, and limits it to Sacraments of the Gospel: perhaps he may think there be two ways whereby God brings his people to Salvation, one ordinary with, and the other extraordinary without Sacraments; nor shall I say more of that, but tell him that if Women and Male Children under the Law might, much more the *Catechumeni* and Infants under the Gospel may be saved by grace

grace without Sacraments to confer or convey it. 3. Though it be not the Scripture mode to observe Logick rules in framing definitions, nor always Arithmetical in making up of accounts: Yet is the nature and end of these Ordinances we call Sacraments, described in Scripture so far as is meet for us to know: The number numbred, Baptism and the Lords-supper said to be instituted by Christ, and no more; and sure then the man may count two, and need not complain for want of the number numbring.

*Secondly,* It's necessary to Salvation, to believe all the Books of Holy Scripture to be the word of God, and to believe nothing written to be the word of God which is Apocryphal; but by the Scripture it cannot be made out plainly and clearly, which Books are the word of God, and which are Apocryphal.

*First,* Your own Doctors distinguish betwixt an affirmative believing and a negative disbelief; and though they make it damnable to disbelieve any one point ( when sufficiently re-  
pre-

presented to the understanding as revealed by God) yet do they not make it necessary, positively and expressly to believe all, or any of the Books of Holy Scriptures to be so revealed; and suppose they did, it matters not, sith it's evident that the Scriptures themselves make believing in the Lord Jesus Christ, and not believing all the Books of Holy Scripture to be the word of God, to be that *Unum necessarium*, that one thing necessary to Salvation. And the Fathers in the Primitive times had differences and doubts about several Books of Scripture now commonly received for Canonical, and yet were saved by the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, even as we.

2. Christians convinced by any means whatsoever, that such and such Books in themselves Apocryphal be the word of God, ought during that conviction believe them to be so, and it is so far from being necessary to Salvation for them, *rebus sic stantibus*, to believe otherwise, that it were obstinacy and interpretatively a denying of Gods veracity for them not so to believe for-

D

mally,

mally, as *Chillingworth*, though not materially an Heresie. 3. True it is that it cannot be made out by Scripture as by a Testimony, or *Argumentum inartificiale*, which Books are the Word of God, and which be Apocryphal; yet may this be made out plainly and clearly by Scripture, *Tanquam per Argumentum artificiale, scilicet*, The Divine Characters that God himself hath imprinted on those Books that be indeed the Word of God: nor need we trouble your Churches Authority, though we confess our selves much beholding to the Churches ministry for the finding of them out.

*Thirdly*, It is necessary to believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God, but there is no Text or Texts of Scripture to prove that the Scriptures which we have, are Gods Word.

1. It is necessary for you and me to believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God, because we are perswaded, though upon several grounds, that they be so; but that it is necessary

fary for all persons so to believe, will not be granted till you further explain your [necessary,] and add proof for the evincing of it. And yet however, 2. There is a Text of Scripture to prove that the Scriptures which we have are Gods Word; For if there be a Text that expressly declares that the Scriptures which the Jews and Christians had in the Primitive times, were the Word of God, there is a Text to prove that the Scriptures which we have, are Gods Word: But there is a Text which expressly declares that the Scriptures which the Jews and Christians had in the Primitive times were the Word of God; *ergo*, There is a Text to prove that the Scriptures which we have, are Gods Word. The *major* is evident from universal Tradition assuring us that the Scriptures we now have, be the same that the Jews and Christians had then. The *minor* is evinced from that of *Paul to Timothy*, whose Mother was a *Jewess*, and Father a *Greek*; *all Scripture is divinely inspired*, 2 Tim. 3.



*Fourthly*, It is necessary to know that the Scriptures are not corrupted, for if they be corrupted they cease to be the Word of God, and then they cannot be any rule or sure guide to us : But of this we have no assurance in Scripture.

1. It is not necessary, as hath been said, to know the Scriptures to be the Word of God ; and therefore not necessary sure to know they are not corrupted. Scripture or Writing is no more than one special means whereby God is pleased to make known, and preserve in the World the knowledge of his Will ; if he do it any where by another Medium, that will suffice. Nay suppose, as the man seems to do all along, that the Scriptures be corrupted, it cannot be necessary to know that they are not corrupted ; unless it be necessary to know that which is not possible to be known, and so all men be necessarily damned. 2. When we say, the Scripture is the Rule whereby to judge of Controversies, it is usually restrained to such controversies as do not concern the  
Scripture.

Scripture. You will not allow us to argue, the Church is no infallible Judge or Rule, because the Church is forced to seek for other and higher proof than her own words to prove her self to be Infallible; and if so, why should we argue the Scripture to be no Rule, because we cannot have assurance in Scripture that it is not corrupted? it will be sufficient that we have assurance some other way. 3. Scripture may be said to be corrupted in Essentials or Accidentals, in whole or in part: It may be corrupted in Accidentals, the Words mis-spelled, Sentences misplaced, Words, or Letters inserted or omitted; and yet the mind and meaning of God what it is, all that notwithstanding, be evident from thence. Every Book almost after its most perfect Edition, hath *Errata's*, and yet the Authors meaning may be plain enough: Nay further, Scripture may be corrupted in some parts, and yet remaining pure in others, *Scriptura per Scripturam*, Scripture may be corrected by Scripture, as a Jesuit of your own hath well observed. D 3

*Fifthly,*

*Fifthly*, It is necessary in order to the knowing of the true mind, meaning, and will of God, and what he intended by such and such a Text, that we know when a Text is to be understood literally, when figuratively, when mystically; but this cannot be understood from Scripture, as daily experience informs us.

1. The Scripture supposes men to have the use of sense and reason; and if so, they may easily conclude, as sure as God is truth, the Spirit spake by the Prophets and Apostles accordingly as he meant; the Prophets and Apostles writ according as the Spirit spake; and writ for that end, that the true mind, meaning, and will of God might be known and understood, which could not be without perpetuated new Revelation, except we might and ought to take that for his mind and meaning which the words in their literal construction hold out unto us.

*De verbo Eum sensum qui ex verbis immediata Dei, l. 3. c. 3 te colligitur, certum est esse sensum Spiritus Sancti.* That, says *Bellarmin*, which is immediately gathered from the

the words, is certain to be the sense of the Holy Ghost. And therefore, 2. vainly does he enquire, and fondly distinguish of several senses of this or that Text, whenas it is apparent from the very writing of it in letters, and the confession of our adversaries, that each Text is to be understood literally. Nor is that he calls figurative, any other than a species of the literal sense: The mystical, an uncertain remote intendment of the things, and not the immediate argumentative meaning of the written Words or Text, which we are now enquiring after. However, 3. *In iis qua aperte in Scripturis posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia qua continent fidem morésque vivendi:* In those things which are laid down plainly in the Scriptures, all those things are found which appertain to Faith and Direction of Life. Dark figurative Texts, and mystical meaning of things may in some sense be useful, yet it is not necessary in order to the knowing of the mind of God, so far as is requisite for us to know, that we

*literalis est duplex; alius simplex, alius figuratus. Bellar. ibid.*

*Augustina & Doctrina Christiana, l. 2. c. 9.*

should be able to unfold them; *Exponat si cui Deus concesserit*: As *Cajetan* of the Revelation. And yet further, 4. There is a difference betwixt being ignorant of such and such a Text, and wresting or wilfully perverting it to a wrong sense: This even in Scriptures not materially necessary to be known, must of necessity be avoided. It is Heretical, it is Soul-destructive, *2 Peter* 3. 19. that anent Texts holding out points commonly called Fundamental, may consist with saving knowledge; for it is the knowing the true mind, meaning and will of God as to such a particular that is necessary, and not just the knowing it by such and such a Text: you may perhaps know it by one Text, and I by another; or you by oral practical tradition, and I by writing.

*Sixthly*, It is necessary to know that the very Copies and Translations of the Scriptures which we have, and upon which we ground ourselves, are certainly true: for if they are not, we build upon uncertainties,

ties; and consequently have no sure foundation for our Faith; yet we cannot be assured, nor have so much as any information as to this particular from the Scriptures.

*First*, The Man does not deny either the being or possibility of knowing, That there be Copies and Translations certainly true; only he asserts, That we have not so much as any information as to this particular, from the Scriptures, which we might, as hath been said, easily grant; and yet upon just Grounds maintain that the Scripture is a rule both plain and perfect, howbeit. *In hac germani textus*  
 we need not do it: for in the per- *pervestigatione satis*  
 vestigation of the true genuine Text, *perspicue*  
 says *Sixtus Quintus*, There was no *inter omnes*  
*Argument more firm and certain to be* *constat, nul-*  
*relyed on,* than the Faith of the antient *lum argu-*  
*Books*: Nor is there a better way, *mentum esse*  
 says a great Rationalist, for the ordi- *certius ac*  
 nary sort, whether of Papists or Prote- *firmius*  
 stants, than to compare their and our *quam anti-*  
 Translations together, and where there *quorum pro-*  
 is no real difference, there to be confi- *batorum*  
 dent they are right: where they differ, *codicum*  
*latino- rum*  
*fidem, &c.*  
*there in præfat.*



*there to be prudent in the choice of their Guide.*

2. There is a certainty Mathematical, Moral, and Spiritual. Mathematical, either touching Copies or Translations of Scripture, is not now to be had. Certainty Moral, such as the nature of the thing will bear, and as much as humane Testimony and industry can afford us, we have: Nor is the building thereupon a founding our Faith upon uncertainties but upon most strong probabilities, such as especially in a matter of Fact and Skill it were extream imprudence and obstinacy, not to rest satisfied withal. Certainty Spiritual, whether of Science or adherence, beyond that which the best rational Evidence can give ground for, is to be had, and sometimes *by*, but not *from* us; you must by Prayer seek unto God for it, every good Gift and every perfect Gift is from above. And if God vouchsafe to give it you as to this particular, touching the whole or part, well; if not, for ought I know, or you are able to evince, you must be content to be without it. However,

ever, 3. You do ill to call the Scripture, *quà Scriptura*, as copied and translated, the foundation of Faith; and worse, to conclude from its uncertainty, as such, that our Faith has no sure foundation: For Scripture under that notion is not the Material, much less either the Formal, or Salvifical object of Faith; nor any more save choicely instrumental in the producing thereof; and I think we may safely affirm, That an Instrument in it self fallible, may be mainly subservient to the supreme Cause, in bringing us both to believe Divine Truths, because Divine, and to acquiesce in him who is the Foundation indeed, and Truth it self, Jesus Christ. Your *English* Priests are fallible; yet instrumental sure, by Preaching, Translating, Writing, to bring persons certainly to believe those Proposals, and to fix upon that Authority, which is supposed in it self to be infallible. *How shall they believe in him on whom they have not heard: And how shall they hear without a Preacher?* Rom. 10. Not how without an infallible Proposer.

But,

But, 4. I much admire the Man should hold it necessary to know, &c. sith it is evident that in *Austin's* time, the *Latin* Translations of the Scripture were innumerable, nor could any man have said this or that is certainly true: The *Septuagint*, said to be used by the Apostles, is confessedly faulty: and though some of the present *Romanists* may be arrived at that height of impudence, as peremptorily to affirm; yet none can rationally make it out, that they know any one Translation that is perfect, or Copy that is uncorrupt. The Council of *Trent* indeed did decree, That the Vulgar Translation should be received for Authentick; but which they meant by Vulgar, or what by Authentick, no body can yet tell: there was *bellum Papale*, after, about the Editions, *Sixtus* against *Clemens*, and *Clemens* against *Sixtus*. Nor can their Doctors yet conclude, whether it is better say, the Translation is free from all errors, or only such as relate to Faith and Manners.

*Seventhly*, It is necessary that the many manifest controversies about  
the

the true sense of Scripture should be decided, because where two contrary senses are imposed and urged, and both affirmed to be the meaning of God, and his Revelation, one only can be true, and he who refuseth that which is true shall be damned: yet these controversies cannot be decided by Scripture.

1. If it be necessary that the many manifest controversies about the true sense of Scripture, should be decided; sure your Supream Infallible Judge is far to blame, that hath not yet decided them, but suffers your own Doctors to controvert the sense of almost every Text of Scripture.

2. We urge, it's true, by Arguments, but it is you alone that Magisterially impose your own meanings as Divine Revelation: and though of two contraries, one sense only can be true, and he that refuseth that sense which he knows to be true, does deserve Damnation; yet that God will certainly damn him, or that the not believing in case he had not known, were a sin damnable,

is

is more I think than God ever told you.

3. Such controversies as are necessary to be decided in the use of lawful means have been, are, and may be decided by Scripture, without either compleating it by, or introducing in the stead thereof any other Rule; and for the rest a mutual forbearance of the Controversitors were far better than your Pretorial decision of the controversies.

*Eighthly*, It is necessary to know, what is purely and absolutely necessary to Salvation to be believed, and what not; that is, as you say, what is fundamental, and what not fundamental; and to be informed of this plainly, lest we erre and be damned: but in this the Scripture is silent.

1. If it be necessary to know what is purely and absolutely necessary to Salvation to be believed, and what not, How comes it to pass that your Church only declares negatively what is not to be believed, or what must not upon pain of Damnation.

nation be disbelieved, and yet never tells affirmatively what is purely and absolutely necessary for us to believe? True, you will have all believe affirmatively, implicitly, whatever your Church believes; but that is nothing to this business, where knowledge of the [what] in an explicit Faith, is necessarily required. All your Doctors conclude, Somewhat must be explicitly believed; and you say, It is necessary to know the Particulars; and yet will not your Church ever be gotten to declare unto us which they be: let her do it when it shall seem good unto her; in the interim, I shall tell you plainly, That,

2. So much of the [what] is fundamentally necessary to be believed, as is needful to bring such or such a person to believe in the [who] and rest on the foundation Jesus Christ; and consequently more may be necessary for one than another, and not necessary at all that the particulars should be determined. For,

3. Saving and Damning depends not upon a precise knowing and believing



lieving just so many points, and no more; but upon a hearty believing or not believing in Jesus Christ. *He that believeth in the Son of God, hath eternal life: He that believeth not, &c. He that hath the Son hath life, he that hath not the Son hath not life, 1 John 5. 12.*

*Ninthly,* It is necessary to believe that God the Father is not begotten; that God the Son is not made but begotten by the Father only; that God the Holy Ghost is neither made nor begotten, but doth proceed, and that from the Father and the Son; that Christ is of one substance with the Father, and that these three are one, and that one three. I refer to consideration, whether all these points be plainly and clearly to be found in Scripture: If they were, it had been almost impossible for so many divisions to have hapned about them, as have done amongst persons on all sides, admitting the Scripture to be the word of God.

1. I refer it also to consideration, Whether all these points be not plainly and clearly to be found in Scripture:

Scripture : And wish you to consult with almost any large *English* Catechism, or common Place book concerning it.

2. The Heart of man is desperately wicked, and many are possessed with a Spirit of blindness : It is one question whether all these points be plainly and clearly to be found in Scripture ? and another, whether all persons that admit the Scriptures to be the word of God, can or will so search as to find them to be there ? Both Jews and Christians admit the Books of the Old Testament for Divine, and yet differ about the weightiest, and as we say, the clearest point. You say the Scriptures are plain and evident for the Churches Infallibility : and yet the Protestants, that admit the Scriptures for the Word of God as well as you do, all deny it.

3. Those so manifold divisions in the Primitive Church, make more against the Churches being a Pretorial Judge, than against Scripture being a perfect Rule. It had been sure altogether impossible that such  
and

and so many points should have been so long controverted; but that either the generality of Christians did not then judge a Pretorial decision of controversies necessary, or that there was none then impowered so to decide them. Howbeit,

4. Is it necessary to believe these points implicitly or explicitly? if but implicitly; it is not necessary in order to the constituting of Scriptures an adequate object or rule of believing, that these points should be plainly contained in them. For plainness respects knowledge of the particulars to be believed, which this kind of Faith supposeth not; and if it be necessary to believe these points explicitly, knowingly, your own Doctors will not deny but that the Scriptures do plainly and perspicuously contain and teach them. *We deny not, saith Costerus, that those chief heads of the Faith, which are to all Christians necessary to be known to Salvation, are plainly and perspicuously comprehended in the Writings of the Apostles. Cujus-*  
*Enchirid. c. 4. p. 49. modi sunt mysterium sanctissimæ Trinitatis & incarnationis Filii Dei; Of*  
 which

whic  
 Hol  
 of t  
 gelic  
 and  
 phet  
 instr  
 conc  
 fore  
 us ta  
 froir  
 Const  
 And  
 larmi  
 calio  
 a pe  
 non  
 been  
 Reli  
 ring,  
 Testi  
 Scrip  
 appe  
 that  
 may  
 plain  
 Scrip  
 Te  
 of E

which sort be the mystery of the Holy Trinity, and Incarnation of the Son of God. The Evangelical and Apostolical Books, and the Oracles of the Antient Prophets, *planè instruunt nos*, do plainly instruct us what is to be thought concerning things Divine. Therefore hostile discord laid aside, let us take the explication of Questions, from the words, *Divinely inspired*, says *Constantine* to the Council of *Nice*:

And now what think ye does *Bel-larmine* reply? why, he takes oc-  
 casion hence to suspect *Constantine* for  
 a person unbaptized, that as yet

See Bellav.  
 min. de ver-  
 bo Dei, l. 4.  
 c. 1.

*non noverit Arcana religionis*, had not been acquainted with the secrets of Religion; howbeit better considering, answers, -2. That there be Testimonies extant in the Holy Scriptures of all the Doctrines which appertain to the nature of God, and that concerning these Doctrines, we may be *plenè & planè*, fully and plainly instructed out of the Holy Scriptures.

Tenthly, It is necessary (the Church of *England* faith) that Infants should be

be Baptized, and Women should receive the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, and Christians should observe the Lords-day; and yet none of these points are clearly and particularly proved from Scriptures

1. It matters not much what you say, elsewhere, this passage sufficiently manifests what sort of Nonconformists you write against, *scil.* not Nonconformists to the Church of *England*, but to the Chair of *Rome*; for if otherwise, wherefore should you urge them in this case with, The Church of *England* saith, &c. And yet however, 2. You must know that if the Church of *England* say, It is necessary that Infants should be Baptized, it is upon a supposition that the affirmative may evidently be proved from Scripture; for if you or any else shall evince that Infants-Baptism cannot be proved from the Scriptures, the Church of *England*, Article the sixth, hath expressly declared against the necessity of it. 2. You cannot but have heard of *hoc homo, ὁ ὃς ἵ ἀνδρῶν*, Let a Man examine

exan  
Wo  
requ  
Aur  
rece  
you  
ferer  
ing  
bein  
obse  
impl  
than  
if h  
Eng  
prov  
This  
war  
E  
gene  
an  
whi  
retic  
so?  
1  
here  
foun  
One  
2. C  
bapt

examine himself, &c. 1 Cor. 11. 28.  
 Women as well as Men are there  
 required, (self examination and not  
 Auricular confession first had) to  
 receive the Eucharist. Nor, 3. Can  
 you be ignorant that there is a dif-  
 ference betwixt the Lords-day be-  
 ing necessary to be observed, and its  
 being necessary that Christians should  
 observe the Lords-day: That would  
 imply a Doctrinal; This no more  
 than an obediencial necessity: That  
 if held by any, the Church of  
 England will tell you, ought to be  
 proved particularly from Scripture;  
 This needs no more but a general  
 warrant.

Eleventhly, It is a sin, (as the  
 generality of Christians agree.)  
 an heresie to re-baptize any one,  
 which hath been baptized by an He-  
 retick, where doth the Scripture say  
 so?

1. Those that hold it a sin and *Videtur*  
 heresie to rebaptize any one, &c. *quod Bap-*  
 found their opinion upon Scripture, *tismus pos-*  
*sit iterari;*  
*One Faith, one Baptism,* Eph. 4. 5. *sed contra*  
 2. Cyprian held, such ought to be re- *est quod*  
 baptized, dyed in that opinion, and *dicitur,*  
 yet *Eph 4.*  
*una fides,*



anum bap-  
tisma. A-  
quinas 3.  
quest. 66.  
Art. 9.

DR WILLIAMS'S

LIBRARY. LONDON.

yet dyed a Saint and Martyr. 3. The Thesis here laid down without restriction is apparently false, contradicting the Nineteenth Canon of the Council of Nice, *Si quis confugit ad Ecclesiam Catholicam de Paulianist. & Cataphrygiis, statutum est rebaptizari.* If any one of the Paulianists and Cataphrygians fly unto the Catholick Church, it is Decreed, That they ought to be rebaptized.

And now it being evident that neither your Argument nor instances make against, but for the Scriptures being a sole sufficient Rule; let us try what they'll do on that account against, or for your *Romish* Church. Whatsoever is a sole sufficient Rule must be plain and clear in all necessary points, at least which relate to Faith: But the *Roman* Church is not plain and clear in all necessary points that relate to Faith; Therefore the *Roman* Church is not the sole sufficient Rule. The *major* is your own, nor shall I need to trouble any body else for instances to prove the *minor*.

First,

3. *First* then it is necessary ; you say, to know how many Sacraments Christ ordained ; and yet your Church leaves it doubtful, whether anointing with Oyl was ordained by Christ a Sacrament or not ; *Insinuated*, she says, it was, *Concil. Mark 6.* but does not, dare not, *Trid. Sess. 14. c. 1.* say, it was there or any where else, instituted as such.

*Secondly*, It is necessary to salvation, you say, to believe all the Books of the Holy Scriptures to be the Word of God, and to believe nothing written to be the word of God which is *Apocryphal* ; And yet as to this, Your Church is so dark and dubious, that though *Bel- See Bellar- larmino* contend that the Council *min. de ver- bo Dei,* of *Trent* did define the additaments *l. 1. c. 7.* to the Book of *Hester* to be canonical ; *Sixtus Senensis* believes otherwise, and brings Arguments against it. Nay, if it be necessary to know which Books be the Word of God and which *Apocryphal*, it is necessary sure to know which Traditions be Dominical or Apostolical, which not ; and yet concerning

ing this your Church is silent.

*Thirdly*, It is necessary to know that the Scriptures are not corrupted; it is necessary to know when a Text is to be understood literally, when figuratively, when My-  
 stically; it is necessary to know that the very Copies and Translations of the Scriptures which we have, and upon which we ground our selves are certainly true; it is necessary that the many manifest controversies about the true sense of Scripture should be decided; it is necessary to know what is Fundamental, what not: and yet as to none of these your Church is plain and clear.

*Fourthly*, It is necessary to believe that God the Father is not begotten; that God the Son is not made but begotten by his Father only; that God the Holy Ghost is neither made nor begotten, but proceedeth from the Father and the Son; that Christ is of one substance with the Father, and that these Three are One, and that One Three: and yet suppose these points not plainly and clearly  
 to

to be found in Scriptures, how possibly could the Church for the first three hundred years be said to be plain and clear concerning them? for during that time there was no General Council whereby she might explain her self, and if she did explain her self in General Councils after, that implied her former darkness and deficiency, with respect to those very points.

*Fifthly*, It is a sin and heresie, you say, to re-baptize any one who hath been Baptized by an Heretick; and yet as hath been said, your Church, that I mean you take the boldness to call your Church, is so far from being plain and clear in this, that she hath defined the contrary: Nay, plainness and clearness owned as it is, and ought to be, for an essential property of the Rule of Faith, the whole of what you have said in behalf of the Church (if granted true) will amount to as much as nothing. For suppose Christ judge the Nations not by his Word and Spirit in the mouths of his Ministers, but, as you phrase it, by his Churches Tribunal

P. 54, 56.

banal in passing of Acts and pronouncing Anathema's; suppose the Church to be what you would have it, and not only led, if she will, but so drawn that she follow the Spirit into all truth, & sic de ceteris, yet what were all this to the purpose? For it would not necessarily follow thence that she is plain and clear in all necessary points: the Apostles sure, if any, might so judge and were

- Pag. 37. so drawn, and yet you say that they in their Epistles are defective, dark, very subject, and that in fundamentals, desperately to be misunderstood. Nor do you trouble us with
- Pag. 61. telling that the Church is always in being, and capable upon demand to explain and declare its own sense; For 1. If we cannot certainly understand the Apostles, when explaining and declaring their sense and meaning, how shall we be able certainly to understand your Church, when explaining and declaring hers, sith the Church hath no other way to explain her meaning, save by words most intelligible, which way the Apostles had

had, and did make use of as is evident from 1 Cor. 14. 2. The question is, whether the Church be actually plain and clear in all necessary points; not whether the Church be capable upon demand to explain and declare its own sense: being plain and clear, and capable upon demand to explain and declare, be different things; this belongs to an Interpreter, of no concern here, it's that that is pertinent and the property of a Rule. And yet 3. The Church diffusive is not capable either of explaining or of being demanded to explain its own sense: Council or Church representative, there has been none at your own account for a whole Century of years, nor likely to be any more, and it cannot be imagined that by Church you should mean the Pope, because, other reasons at present omitted, you refer to a Church always in being: However, 4. *Frustra est potentia quæ non reducitur in Actum*: What are we nearer having, or the Church nearer being



ing a Rule of Faith, for her being capable of doing that, which by no means she'l be gotten to do? Often has she been demanded, I now demand, and desire you to demand her, to explain her self touching the points forementioned, as also touching those after instanced in the close of my answer to the third Querie; and if she do explain her sense as to those points, we shall conclude that hitherto she hath not been a sole sufficient Rule, for want of that explanation; if she do not, at the best she'l be but remotely capable of being hereafter, and at present be no Rule of Faith; nor yet indeed is she capable at this account of being hereafter, or rather, would you speak properly, making such a Rule, because disenabled by the first general Council at *Ephesus* from ever making *tanquam de fide* any such an explanation.

Can. 7.

That there are in the Scriptures several places which to common reason seem contradictions, and consequently some parts of Scripture seem

seem untrue, is easily proved: And I shall here give you some few plain instances for example, to which many more might be added.

*First,* It's well you distinguish betwixt private and common Reason; for though you exempt each mans private Spirit or Reason, from meddling about interpreting of Scriptures, you'll surely admit common Reason to be of special use, unless you'll say that Reason ought to be abused for finding out of contradictions in Scriptures; but must by no means be employed either in unfolding or reconciling the difficult places that occur therein.

*Secondly,* Either Reason can judge of things and propositions, when contradictory, or not: if not, wherefore do you tell stories of several places seeming to common Reason to contradict one another, so seeming that thereupon Scripture must be rejected from being a Rule; and if Reason can thus judge, wherefore should not your Church be rejected from being a Rule as well as Scriptures, sith her

Doctrines seem to Reason, and often to common Sense too, to be more contradictory than any of these Texts. A Council is above the Pope: A Council is not above the Pope: *hoc* this, *scilicet* bread or nothing, is the body, is really Christs body at London, at Rome, on Earth, in Heaven, the very same moment. Every man is a liar; The Pope as Pope is a man, (unless he be either *Accidens* or *animal irrationale*) and yet the Pope as Pope is no liar, in no possibility to be mistake. Nay further, these very places you say seem contradictory, your Church teaches to be certainly true in her Authoritative approval of the Canon of Scripture: so that if upon this account you'll reject Scripture, upon the same account you may, must reject the Church from being a Rule: and yet rather the Church than the Scripture, for the Scripture barely presents us with the places; your Church passeth sentence, says they are all true: unless you'll tell us your Churches saying can make contradictions true at once,

once, and warrant you to believe it; howbeit Gods saying cannot do so.

*Thirdly*, Had you had many more plain instances, it is not like you would have troubled the Reader with these: your task is to prove, that the Scripture is not plain and clear in all necessary points: and is it not then for want of some more pertinent, that you present us with doubts and difficulties about Chronologies and Genealogies, concerning which the Apostle forbids us to dispute: you had better have said with the great Master of Reason, *Grotius*, *afflatu Dei locutos quæ locuti sunt, scripsisse quæ scribere jussi sunt Prophetas; de scriptis Historicis & Moralibus Hebraeorum sententiis aliud puto.*

In 2 Kings chap. 8. verse 26. you read thus, *Twenty two years old* Pag. 45.  
*was Ahaziah when he began to reign,*  
*and he reigned one year in Jerusalem;*  
*and his Mothers name was Athaliah,*  
*the Daughter of Omri.* But 2 Chron.  
 chap. 22. verse 2. you will read thus,  
*Forty and two years old was Ahaziah*  
E 4
when

when he began to reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem; his Mothers name was Athaliah the daughter of Omri. Now against the infallibility of Scripture, Reason conceiveth herself to have this infallible demonstration, viz. No one who speaketh two things, the one contrary to the other, can be said to be infallible in speaking: but to affirm of the same person that he began to reign when he was two and twenty years old, and that he was two and forty years old when he began to reign, is to speak two things, the one contrary to the other; therefore saith Reason, the Scripture is not infallible in speaking.

*First*, I am glad to find you in hand with infallible demonstrations: for if demonstrations Theological be to be had, and may be owned as infallible, I hope there will be no great need amongst sober persons, of your judicial Decisions, unless you can get licence to demonstrate against, and we neither for, by, nor from the Scriptures.

*Secondly*,

*Secondly*, Your Major is denied ; for heat and cold are two things contrary one to another, and yet I hope God himself may be infallible, notwithstanding he hath said, *Summer and Winter, heat and cold, Gen. 8. 22.* You would say if you could speak, No one that delivereth two propositions, the one contrary to the other, can be said to be infallible ; though yet this will not do neither, for you your self might speak and write too these two propositions, *Abaziah began to reign when he was forty and two years old : And Abaziah began to reign when he was twenty and two years old*, and yet this notwithstanding, did nothing else hinder, be infallible. But that it may be sense and pertinent, your Major must be supplied from your Minor : No one that affirms two things of the same person that are contrary the one to the other, can be said to be infallible in speaking : But to affirm of *Abaziah*, that *he was twenty and two years old when he began to reign ; and that he was forty and two years old when he began to reign*, is to speak two things



See Light-  
foots Har-  
mony in  
106.

contrary the one to the other; yes, and more too, or else nothing to the purpose, *scilicet*, to affirm of the same person two things contradictory one to the other, which yet this Scripture doth not: for the Book of *Chronicles* in this place meaneth not that *Abaziah* was so old when he began to Reign; but these two and forty years, have relation to another thing, namely to the Kingdom of the House of *Omri*, and not to the Age of *Abaziah*; for count from the beginning of the reign of *Omri*, and you find *Abaziah* to enter his Reign in the two and fortieth year from thence.

The Original words therefore *Ben anbagumi Usherhaiim Shunah* are not to be translated as they be, *Abaziah* was two and forty years old, but *Abaziah* was the Son of the two and forty years; as *Sedar Olam* hath acutely observed long ago: nor should you tell us now of our different translations, unless it could be made appear that the Church in all ages had, and of necessity ought to have one authentick Translation. Or,

Secondly,

*Secondly*, that our Translations do not clearly and with one consent deliver to us all points necessary to be believed, differing only in some punctilio's of an inferior concern. Or,

*Thirdly*, That it may not be as lawful for us to propose what seems agreeable to Reason for the removing, as 'tis for you to urge what seems contradictory to Reason, for the raising of objections against a book of Scripture so universally received for Canonical: And your Minor thus mended, is denied; for contradictories must be *ad idem*, in the same respect, as well as *de eodem*, concerning the same person. *Ahaziah* began to reign with his sickly infirm Father when he was twenty and two years old, and the same *Ahaziah* was forty and two years old when he began to reign himself alone: or if this will not satisfy, you may consult with your own *Cornelius de lapide* upon the place, he'll tell you of the *Syriack* and *Arabick* Translations, both those of *Antich* or

Mount

See Peter  
Martyr. in  
loc.

Mount *Sinai*, the *Alexandrian* or *Coptic*, that for *forty two*, have *twenty two*; and he that is offended at the other, may use this reading. Nor is it, saith he, the interpreters, but the Scripture it self that corrects it self, corrupted by the Transcribers. The book of *Kings* corrects the book of *Chronicles*: nor need we go further than Scripture for salving of the other difficulties; for *1 Chron. 3. 16.* will teach you to insert *Joechim* or *Jachim* betwixt *Josias* and *Jeconiah*. *Mat. 1. 11.* and so compleat your number of *forty two*; and *Gen. 10. 22.* will tell you to put out *Canna* from betwixt *Sem* and *Arphaxad*, put in upon special Reason, as is conceived by the *Seventy*, and retained as likely by *S. Luke chap. 3. 36.* the better to win upon the *Gentiles*.

See Light-  
foots Har-  
mony in  
loco.

*The Argument from Heaven, for  
the Roman Churches being Judge  
and Guide, solved.*

**A**Nd now that I may con- Pag. 74.  
clude my whole proof with  
an Argument from Heaven, and by  
a Testimony of the highest nature  
make it evident to you, that this  
Roman Catholick Church must be  
this Church, which God hath ap-  
pointed to be this Guide and Judge,  
I shall insist upon the gift of Mira-  
cles; this was that Testimony which  
our blessed Redeemer did himself  
produce, as his Letters of Credence,  
and as both necessary and sufficient  
to prove his mission, *If I had not (saith  
our Lord, Joh. 15. 24.) done among  
them the works that no other man did,  
they had not had sin, namely, in not be-  
lieving me to be the Messiah. God  
there-*

The

therefore hath decreed it as a Law that whosoever refuseth to believe and submit unto that authority, unto which he sets his hand and Seal by bestowing on it the gift of Miracles, that Person committeth sin: the reason is given in the same Text, *viz.* because he thereby sheweth that he hateth God, namely by not believing him. Now I urge, But the Roman Catholick Church hath done Works and Miracles amongst us, such as no other Christian Church upon Earth hath done; Therefore if we give credit to any other Church or Churches, and disbelieve or refuse to believe her, we shall have sin, and shew our selves to be haters of God.

*First,* You pretend here to conclude your proof with an argument from Heaven, and yet have you not hitherto produced so much as one Testimony of the lowest nature; somewhat you have said indeed, which is already touched, to prove what we grant, *scilicet*, that no other Church can be; but have not

Law,  
believe  
, unto  
Seal,  
f Mira-  
ch sin:  
same  
y shew-  
nely by  
urge,  
Church  
cles a-  
r Chri-  
ndone;  
any o-  
d disbe-  
, we  
elves to  
  
o con-  
gument  
ve you  
o much  
west na-  
said in-  
ned, to  
er, that  
ut have  
not

not said a word to make good what  
you your self affirm, viz. that the  
Roman Church is, this infallible Rule,  
Judge and Guide. And let me tell you  
by the way, either you can prove this  
your Church infallible, or you cannot:  
If you cannot, wherefore should we  
believe it? If you can, either by  
Revelation, or by Reason: Divine  
revelation, it's apparent, you nei-  
ther do, can, nor attempt to pro-  
duce: and as for Reason, you have  
already proved it to be fallible; so  
that at best, how much soever you  
may seem to be taken with your  
own fallacies, your Church can be  
proved but fallibly to be infallible. But,

*Secondly*, There is a difference  
betwixt the gift, and the power of  
working Miracles. You do, it's true,  
insist upon the gift, but should make  
it out that your Church has power  
of working Miracles, if you'll evince  
her, Christ-like, to be infallible:  
this was necessary; that had not  
been sufficient to have proved his  
mission: It is therefore somewhat  
loose arguing, for you to conclude, the  
Jews



*Jews* committed sin, were haters of God, for not believing Jesus to be the Messiah, who did amongst them the work which no other man did, viz. wrought Miracles by his own power; and therefore Christians commit sin, shew themselves haters of God in not believing the Roman Church to be infallible, because she has the gift, can do works (howbeit, none among us) like other men, viz. work Miracles in the name and power of another. And hence,

*Thirdly*, We deny Gods having decreed any such a Law as you tell of; for though an Authority, to which God sets his hand and seal, by bestowing on it the gift of Miracles, may be rendred thereby (like that of *Saul* and the Seventy, by the spirit of Prophecy) more than ordinary venerable; and whosoever refuseth to believe and submit to an Authority, knowing it to work Miracles by its own power; that person committeth sin, and sheweth himself an hater of God: yet may an Authority divinely signed and

1 Sam. 10.

Numb. 11.

ters of and sealed by having that gift, be  
to be disbelieved (however, submission  
t them still due whether it have the gift or  
an did, not) without contracting any such a  
s own guilt: not disbelieved, do I mean, in  
ristians a particular Doctrine, that it shall actu-  
ters of ally and visibly confirm by Mira-  
Roman cles; but disbelieved, when teaching  
ife she t self and all other Authorities that  
wbeit, have that gift, to be disbelievable upon  
a, viz. that account, or *de debito* believed in all  
pow- that they should dictate forth unto us:  
That being indeed a Doctrine never  
having confirmed by Miracles, nor delive-  
ou tell red by him that had the power of  
7, to working of them. Though yet,

seal, *Fourthly*, It cannot be made out  
Mira- that Christ did set his hand and  
(like seal either to this or that Authority,  
, by by bestowing on it any such a gift; for  
than particular believers had that gift be-  
ever stowed upon them, as well as the A-  
to an postles; *these signs shall follow them that*  
t Mi- *believe, &c. Mark 16. 17.* Nor did the  
per- Apostles work Miracles by virtue  
werth of their Authority, but by Faith; *If*  
yet *ye have Faith as a grain of Mustard-*  
igned *seed, &c. Matt. 17. 20.* And though  
and I

I have all Faith, &c. 1. Cor. 13. 2. And when Peter saw it, he answered unto the People, Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though we by our own Power and Holiness, had made this man to walk? His name through Faith in his name hath made this man strong, &c. yea the faith which is by him, hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all, Act. 3. 12, 16. And hence sure it is, that in your Minor you leave out Authority, mention neither Seal nor Gift, but barely urge and assume — Now the Roman Catholick Church hath done, &c. not now God hath set his hand and seal to the Authority of the Roman Catholick Church, by bestowing upon it the gift of Miracles: Nor is it any marvel that you do so, for if that gift were bestowed upon that Authority, the Pope and Council that are invested with it, should work Miracles, which yet they do not, nor do you insist on any such a thing; and yet if that gift be not bestowed up-  
on

3.2. And in that Authority, it cannot bestow  
 unto the upon inferiour Officers: it wants  
 marvel Gods Hand and Seal, and may ac-  
 earnestly cording to the tenor of your own  
 in Power Argument be disbelieved, be dis-  
 man to obeyed, without either committing  
 in his sin, or shewing hatred against God.  
 ng, &c. However, 5. If a Church may pro-  
 , hath perly be said to work Miracles,  
 in the when yet indeed it is not the Church,  
 2, 16. but some particular believer that  
 a your works them, and that not in the  
 ority, name of the Church, but in the  
 it, but name of Christ; Other Christian  
 -Now Churches have done as great Works  
 h hath or Miracles in former Ages as the  
 th set Roman Church ever did; witness  
 ority the Church of *Corinth*, that came  
 urch, behind in no gift, 1 Cor. i. 7. and  
 ift of yet were not they reputed thereupon  
 that either Judges of controversies, or  
 were infallible; nor does the present Ro-  
 , the man Church do any greater Works  
 inve- or Miracles than other Christian  
 acles, Churches now on earth. What  
 you does she, what can she do here  
 yet amongst us, more than our Prote-  
 up- stant Church doth (amongst you,)  
 on save

save make louder lying boasts of  
 what she has done elsewhere? And  
 therefore shall not we refuse to  
 believe them, or resolve to give  
 credit unto her upon any such ac-  
 count, and conclude our so doing  
 to be warrantable, and well enough  
 consistent with the love we owe un-  
 to the Lord; wishing you yet with-  
 al to remember, That the Question  
 is not solely or chiefly whether this or  
 that Church ought to be believed or  
 disbelieved in their Doctrinal teach-  
 ing; but whether the *Roman Church*  
 be the infallible Rule, Judge, and  
 Guide of Faith? Doctrinal cer-  
 tainty will not infer Judicial Au-  
 thority, nor *e contra*: Nay suppose  
 your Church were Doctrinally in-  
 fallible, and had universal Jurisdic-  
 tion, yet would it not necessarily fol-  
 low that she is the Rule of Faith.  
 The Prophets of old, you will say,  
 were infallible, and the High Priests  
 had judicial power, and yet to the  
*Law and to the Testimony*, Isaiah  
 8. 20. It was therefore prudently  
 done of you to alter the Question,  
 First

First leave out Rule, and undertake to prove no more by your Argument from Heaven, but that the *Roman* Church was Judge and Guide; and then finding after a while, that that would not do neither, you leave out Judge or Authority, and tell us of believing and disbelieving, as if it would follow, The *Roman* Church ought to be believed in all that she says, and therefore has she plainly said all that we ought to believe, is a Rule of Faith compleat and evident; howbeit indeed, had she authoritatively and infallibly so said, not she, but her sayings in propriety of Speech were to be owned for the Rule.

Now that the *Roman* Church hath P. 76.  
done these works or Miracles, is a thing so evident both by the testimonies of the Holy Fathers, and authorities of approved Historians, that those who deny it must shew themselves either not to be Men, or Men who purposely shut their Eyes against the truth; yea, Heathens  
and



and Atheists will be as justifiable in their denial of the Miracles related in the Old and New Testament, as those will be who deny these. The *Magdeburgenses*, who were all professed and known *Lutherans*, do almost in every one of their Centuries recount multitudes of Miracles wrought by persons whom they affirm to have been infected with what they call Popery: Namely, S. Bernard, S. Malacty, S. Dominick, S. Francis, and the like; as you may particularly see in *Brerely*, if you examine the several places to which his Index at the word Miracles will refer you: By which it will appear, That most of those Miracles were done not in confirmation of those Points and Articles of Faith which you hold with us; but even of those Points and Doctrines which you call Popish Superstitions and Idolatries, as the Sacrifice of the Holy Mass, the respect and veneration which is given to Saints, Reliques, Images, &c. Certainly there are

are few amongst you, but have heard and read, how and what Christian Faith was first brought into *England* amongst our Progenitors the *Saxons*, and by whom brought in: It was by *S. Austin* a Monk of *S. Benets* Order, and his fellow Monks, sent hither by *S. Gregory* the then Pope of *Rome*; and it was the same Faith that Catholicks now teach, which was then confirmed by wonderful Miracles from Heaven, as is testified by our own Writers, Venerable *Bede* and others; yea and by our Protestant Chronologies, *Holingshead's* Chronicle, the last Edition, Vol. 1. Book 5. Cap. 21. Page 100, 102. *Fox's* Acts and Monuments, Printed Anno 1576. Pag. 117. *Stow's* Annals, Printed 1592. Pag. 66. *Goodwin* in his Catalogue of the Bishops of *England*, Pag. 4. Also *Fox* in his aforelaid Book, at the Word Miracles in the Index. To this I shall add the Authorities of our own late Protestant Writers, for proof of undoubted Miracles wrought in this latter Age.

In

In the Book entituled, *A report of the Kingdom of Congo, a Region of Africa*, Printed Anno 1597. Published by Mr. *Abraham Hartwel*; Servant to the Lord Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, mention is made, *Lib. 1. Cap. 1.* of the discovery of that Kingdom, 1587. by *Odoardo Lopez*, and of the conversion thereof to the Christian Faith, *Lib. 2. Cap. 2.* and of the great and undoubted Miracles shewed by God in the presence of a whole Army, *Lib. 2. Cap. 3.* Insomuch that the said *Hartwell*, in his Epistle there to the Reader, confesseth, That this conversion of *Congo* was accomplished by Massing Priests, after the *Romish* manner; and saith he, this action which tendeth to the glory of God, shall it be concealed and not committed to memory, because it was performed by Popish Priests and Popish means? God forbid. In like manner Mr. *John Pory* of *Gonville* and *Cajus Colledge* in *Cambridge*, in his *Geographical History of Africa*, published Anno 1600.

1600. Pag. 410, 413. commendeth Mr. *Hartwel* for publishing the aforesaid Miracles, and acknowledgeth the same.

1. The common people may, must be deluded by lying Wonders: but sith you are so sober as not to insist upon our *English* Popish Priests, either throwing in, or throwing out of Devils; you did wisely, when giving in your Catalogue of Miracles done by the *Romish* Church, to leave out [amongst us] and yet suppose the *Roman* Church hath done these Miracles; and done them [amongst us] it is little to the point; for if she did them in her own name and power, she is no more a Church but a God, the *Messias*; and if she did them in the name and power of Christ, it will evince Christ, in whose name and power the Miracles were wrought, to be the Son of God, and consequently infallible; but leave your Church subject to mistakes as formerly she was. However, 2. It is one thing to say, it is

F

evident

evident both by Testimonies of Holy Fathers and approved Historians; and another thing to produce those Testimonies: and yet if you had, those Testimonies could be no more than Humane, capable of mistake, in a possibility of being erroneous, and consequently the thing as to us, be no more at your own account, than probably true; our belief, or opinion rather, no better founded than the persuasions of the Jews, Turks, or Pagans; all upon a fallible certainty. Nor yet, 3. Can it be said either with truth or modesty, that the Heathens and Atheists will be as justifiable in their denials of the Miracles revealed in the Old and New Testament, as those Men will be that deny these. For though the relation of the Miracles in the Old and New Testament be brought down to us by humane means, yet such as be in no wise (morally) questionable; and besides, all is ultimately resolved into Testimony Divine: Whereas these reports of  
yours,

yours, first and last, have no firmer a Basis than the Testimony of Men blinded, byassed by interest, and that could not certainly know a true Miracle from a lying Wonder, had they stood by at the working thereof. 4. It may be true that the *Magdeburgenses*, with some others, writing the Churches general History, recount as from your own Authors, several Miracles to have been done by persons infected with Popery: But it is as true that they themselves account of them all as no better than either illusions of Dæmons, or false narrations. And well may we grant with *Abraham Hartwell*, *John Pory*, and some more of ours, True Miracles to have been wrought by Popish persons; and not conclude with you, Popish, but Christian Doctrine to have been confirmed by them: For if they did Miracles, it is apparent they did them as Christians, and not as Papists, in the name of Christ, and not in the name of the Pope; nor need you stumble at such a distinction. For *Bellarmin*

*Bellarmin de  
Notis Eccles.*



unto the Miracle of *Novatianus* the Heretick, answereth, the Miracle to have been wrought not for the confirmation of the Faith of *Novatianus*, but of Catholick Baptism. And yet suppose Miracles wrought to confirm the truth of certain Popish Doctrines, what is that to the infallibility of the Popish Church? that learned Cardinal saw the *non sequitur* well enough; and therefore labours by Miracles to prove the verity, not the infallibility of that Church, and to prove it by them credibly, not certainly. For faith he, before the approbation of the Church, it is not evident or certain with the certainty of Faith concerning any Miracle that it is a true Miracle. However, 5. The most antient Author you or your Index pretend to quote, is *Beda*, who flourished *Anno 720.* the most antient Miracle-Monger, the Monk *Austin*, who came into *England* about the Year 600. an evident sign that your Popish Doctrines, if brought forth, yet were not confirmed from Heaven

ven for the first six hundred years after Christ : Nor were those you instance in, ratified on Earth by any General Council for a long time after that. The first pretended for Image-Worship is the second of *Nice*, Anno 705. condemned by that of *Frankford*, Anno 794. And the first for Transubstantiation was that of *Lateran*, 1215. For the most notorious of the rest you must come down as low as the Council of *Trent*, begun since *Luther's* death. And for a Miracle neither *England*, *France*, *Italy* nor *Spain* can furnish you with one; but you are forced to run as far as *Congo*, a Kingdom in the Region of *Africa*, and there resolve your Faith into a Book, said by *John Brerely*, Anno 1664. to have been published Anno 1597. by *Abraham Hartwell* Servant to the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* ( without any leave from his Master ) which Book yet, for ought appears, neither mentions Miracles done to confirm the truth of any Popish Doctrine, nor the Infallibility of the *Roman Church*.

Pag. 78. If any of you should chance to say, That this Testimony of Miracles is nothing to you, because you have never seen a Miracle: I answer, Either you grant what these Authors report, to be true, or you deny their Testimony, refusing to believe what you have not seen. If you grant the truth of these things, and yet remain out of the Communion of the Holy Catholick Church, upon which God hath conferred this Gift, you have sin, and hate God, according to the argument framed by our Lord himself, which I have before cited. *If you refuse to believe what you have not seen,* First, You destroy Faith, *which is an evidence of things not seen.* Secondly, You take away all humane conversation; no man must believe another. Thirdly, you make it unjust for Civil Magistrates to punish Transgressors or Felons: for where there is no Law, there can be no breach of a Law; and if there be no Law to him who did not actually see the very Statute which

which was passed in Parliament, and hear the King and both Houses agree unto it ( as in this case there is no Miracle to him who did not see it ) how can you with Justice condemn and execute a Malefactor, who shall urge at the Barr that he never saw the Statute upon which he stands Indicted ; nor had any knowledge or notice thereof otherwise than by hear-say, and the report of Authors and Books ; which, since they are no sufficient proof of Gods setting his Hand and Seal to a Law by Miracles, he sees no reason why they should be proofs for passing that Statute; and consequently, that as to him that Statute is not in force. What you would reply to one who should give this for his Plea, upon such an Indictment, suppose as said unto your self in the case of Miracles not seen by you, but reported by good Authority. Lastly, this would excuse all Infidels who have been since the Apostles times, even those that lived in their times, in case they saw

no Miracles. But if any of you shall further say after the learned *Chillingworth*, That God in his Justice may permit some true Miracles to be wrought to delude Men who have forged many: I answer, That by this you help the Jews who refused to believe the Doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, notwithstanding their Miracles. For why may not they say; God in his Justice for our sins might permit those true Miracles to be wrought by Jesus Christ and his Apostles to delude us who have forged many? I hope this Answer will satisfie any rational person; but if it do not, I have another answer to give out of Mr. *Chillingworth's* own words, Pag. 144. It is impossible that God should lye, or that the Eternal truth should set his Hand and Seal to the confirmation of a falshood; or of such a Doctrine as is partly true and partly false: the Apostles Doctrine was thus, (*viz.* by Miracles) confirmed; therefore it was intirely true, and in no particular false or uncertain.

uncertain. If you reply, this contradicts Mr. *Chillingworth's* former position: I must answer, That if Mr. *Chillingworth* be found to contradict himself, relying upon his own reason, it is not my fault, nor doth it make any thing against our Church.

1. If you will have us guilty of Sin, and Haters of God; for refusing to believe on that account; it is necessary, according to the tenor of your own law, that the Miracles be done amongst, and seen of, us. *If I had not done amongst them, the works which no other Man did, they had not had sin; but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father.* And yet I think it is by chance indeed, if any say, That this Testimony is nothing to them, meerly because they have not seen a Miracle; it is the Testimony itself that they except against. And yet, 2. There is a difference betwixt remaining out of Communion, and remaining out of subjection, to that you call the Holy Catholick



tholick Church: Suppose we granted the truth of these things, it might perhaps be a sin to remain out of her Communion, and yet a duty to remain out of her subjection. Miracles, as hath been said, may evince the truth of such and such a Church; and yet make nothing at all in order to the proving of her either Supreme or Infallible: though yet, mistake me not, by Communion, I do not mean a communion total or local in all her Doctrines and polluted modes of Worship; but partial Spiritual in those Doctrines and Performances, supposed to be confirmed by those Miracles. However, 3. It is well you make it no worse with them that refuse to believe these things they have not seen, than to destroy Faith, and take away all humane converse, &c. I was afraid you would have charged them as Christ did the Jews, *with sin against the Holy Ghost*; though yet, as it is, your charge is so high, it can never be made good. For may not Faith, think

think you, evidence *things not seen*, upon the account of Divine Revelation, unless we believe what we never saw, upon the report of *Abraham Hartwell* and *John Brerely*? May not one Man believe another about worldly things with a humane Faith, unless one Man believe another about Heavenly Doctrines with a Faith Divine? Or can Thieves and Traytors ever imagine, that a Law publickly promulged by the King, and practically attested by the whole Nation, may as warrantably be pleaded against by them, as the private Testimony of a few ignote Travellers may be excepted against by us, especially when they discourse largely about Miracles; which, if your own Doctors say true, neither they, nor any Man else can with certainty distinguish from lying Wonders? We have notice of the Reigns and Acts of the several Kings and Queens of *England*, no otherwise than by hear-say, and by Authors and Books; and we have notice of the Lives and Acts

Acts of *Bevise of Southampton, Robin Hood, and Little John*, by hear-say, Authors, and Books; and will any conclude the one is to be credited as well as the other, because they have seen neither, and both come to us reported by that, you may have the forehead to call, a good Authority? Your grand Argument as is before observed, comes to nothing, because we have not seen your Miracles; howbeit we give a ground for no such inferences as these, but are ready to proportion our belief according to the worth and weight of the Testimony, be it Divine or humane. Nor yet will the Infidels be excused, for that they have not seen the Miracles; for in the Apostles time, *Their sound went into all the Earth, and their words unto the utmost parts of the World*, Rom. 10. 18. And now in these days, besides the universal Tradition of the Church, we have reasons and Records undeniable, to evince the truth of Christianity, and of Miracles having been done to confirm

firm it: Howbeit those who have not heard at all, or heard no better proofs for the truth of Christian Religion, than you bring for your Popish Miracles, if excusable for not believing before; doubtless may yet remain in the same venial condition as they were.

And now for a close, 4. Give me leave to mind you, 1. That in the beginning of this Epistle, you would have Faith destroyed, transformed into Fancy, Humour, and Opinion, if built on any foundation save Divine Revelation, or what we did certainly know to be infallibly true. And now here you will have a total destruction of Faith, unless it may be built upon the private Apocryphal reports of *Abraham Hartwell*, *John Pory*, *John Brerely*, and such like Men, not only fallible, subject to error, and in a possibility to be mistaken in this very thing; but Men that cannot be concluded with any probability of reason to be in a capacity to know the certain truth of what

what they say, they do affirm.  
 2. You can now present us with an argument from Mr. *Chillingworth*, sufficient at once both to convince an Heathen of the truth of Christianity, and to prove the Divinity of the Scriptures. It is impossible that God should lye, and that the Eternal Truth should set his Hand and Seal to the confirmation of a falsehood, or of such Doctrine as is partly true and partly False. The Apostles Doctrine was thus, (*viz.* by Miracles) confirmed: Therefore it was intirely true, and in no particular false or uncertain: And yet in your Discourse with the Lay Gentleman, you had not a word to say for the truth of Christianity upon Protestant Grounds; nor any thing for Scriptures being the Word of God, save that the Spirit witnessed with your Spirit, they were so. 3. The Gospel, Scripture Doctrines we preach, are like your universal essential predications, Eternal; once confirmed by Miracles in themselves, or their Principal, they need  
 no

no more. This proposition, The *Roman* Church is infallible, has a personal mutable *individuum* for its subject, changes every Age, may change every year; and therefore still stands in need of new miraculous confirmations: insomuch that would we give you leave to suppose Miracles wrought in *Bede's* time, not simply to confirm the Doctrine taught, but the then *Roman* Churches infallibility in teaching; yet would that make nothing at all to prove, either that the now *Roman* Church is infallible, or her new devised Doctrines certainly true. 4. The former position you father on Mr. *Chillingworth*, will be taken for your own, till such time as you quote the Chapter, Section or Page, where you had it; and if then, as much may not be done for Mr. *Chillingworth* against you, as Mr. *Chillingworth* in the like case hath done for Bishop *Usher* against *Knott*, we shall confess him a Man; what would you more? and fallible; and yet withal tell you, that



that his Arguments remain unanswered, nay unanswerable by your Church; nor will so wise a man's contradicting of himself make any thing at all against, but for the establishing the Doctrine of ours, *Let God be true and every Man a Liar*, Rom. 3. 4. *Bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ*, 2 Cor. 10. 5. 5. *Clodius accusat Mæchum*: You tax Mr. Chillingworth with contradicting of himself, and yet you are taken in that very act; you blame that learned Writer for relying too much upon his own reason, and yet you would have us build our Faith upon yours; we must have reasons forsooth, without revelation, for conversion and submission to the said Church.

The

*The Six Queries answered.*

**B**UT yet all after this, I fear some Pag. 84.

of you will blame me for having joyned with this Catholick Church, to which by Gods mercy I am united, and judge me as having taken the wrong way. To those who shall remain so perswaded, I make this humble request, and conjure them by all the Obligations of Brotherly Love, and as they have any charity for my Soul, that they will please to tell me, *First,*  
*&c.*

*First,* Fear of blame argues a sense of Guilt; you confess your having joyned with [this] Catholick Church, and that implies your having separated from [the] Catholick Church, the very thing your old Brethren do, and that upon just grounds, blame you for. And  
 therefore,

therefore, 2. Do not take Gods name in vain; never say that it was by Gods mercy, but because of your own sin and folly, that you are now divided from the communion of Christians, *that are all one in Christ Jesus*, according to *Gal. 3. 28.* and are become united to a Sect of Papists, that center in nought else save three Words, which you cannot construe, *Roman, Catholick Church*, without either Christian or Holy.

*Thirdly*, How can you but judge your self to have taken a wrong way, when as you know you have left Gods way, an explicit Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; and have taken up a way of your own, *viz.* an implicate believing as the Church believeth? When the poor Jaylor enquired, *Acts 16. 31. What shall I do to be saved?* Pray now, did the Apostle direct him to go that way you have taken, or that way you have left? Howbeit; indeed you cannot rightly be said to walk in that wrong way you have taken, or to believe

believe as the Church believes, because the Church hath one manner and Rule of believing, and you another; unless you'll say, what yet I think you will not, that the Church, like you, believes she neither knows what, nor in whom, and is a Rule of believing unto her self. 4. Humble requests and Brotherly love we shall let alone till another time, but out of Charity to your Soul, and tenderness of many others, a solution is endeavoured to all your Quæries.

*First*, Whether they themselves are certain, past all possibility of being mistaken, that the Christian Religion is the only safe way to Salvation: *i. e.* Whether they are infallibly sure of this point, and how come they to be so infallibly assured?

1. It is not so proper to say, Christian Religion, as that Christ is the only way to Salvation; *I am the way*, *John. 14. 6.* nor need there should be any addition of [safe] as if there were other ways to Salvation though somewhat

what dangerous : For there is no other name under Heaven given amongst men, whereby we must be saved ; neither is Salvation in any other, Act. 4. 12.

Bellarmins saying, *tutissimum est*, was well for a Papist, yet would ill become the mouth of a Protestant.

2. Though we shall not say that we are certain of this point *ex parte nostri*, beyond all possibility of mistaking ; for that were to make our selves Gods pure Acts, not men compounded *ex actu & potentia*, of what we are, and what we may be : Yet we say we are ascertained hereof *ex parte Dei*, beyond all possibility of being mistaken ; because God that cannot lie, hath declared it, and taken away the actual hurt of that mist, that yet naturally we are still prone unto. And hence,

3. Though we do not say that we can infallibly assure our selves, nor dare say that we are infallibly sure of this or any other point ; Yet we affirm that we are most sure of this point, Historically, Morally, as men ; so sure, as the best Authentick Histories,  
Univer-

Universal Traditions, and the most rational Arguments can make us sure, with a certainty, *cui non subest dubium*, exclusive of all doubt: Though yet, this notwithstanding, as some do, and we may surmise, *poteſt ſubefſe falſum*, there is a poſſibility of its being otherwiſe, a poſſibility of our being miſtaken.

2. We are aſſured hereof infallibly, ſpiritually, as Chriſtians, finding in our ſelves a faith of adherence freely given beyond, and beſides that of evidence by natural means to be obtained; nor will it be either reaſonable or charitable for you to call this our faith fancy: for ſith we make it out, that what we believe is true, *objective*, beyond all contradiction of Reaſon; wherefore ſhould you queſtion the goodneſs of the God of truth in confirming us *ſubjective*, eſpecially when we, who know our own Hearts, if not well enough, yet better than you, affirm, that from time to time we experience  
it,



it, are ready to seal it with our lives, and that Ancient godly Book, called the Bible, hath many speeches and promises of such a tendency?

*Secondly*, Whether they have the same assurance, and from the same grounds; or from what grounds, that this sort of Christianity, wherein I now worship God, is erroneous and damnable?

1. We do not say, that sort of Christianity wherein you worship God, is erroneous and damnable; but that that sort of Popery wherein you worship Images, invoke Saints, adore a piece of bread, &c. is so.  
 2. That this sort of Popery is erroneous and damnable, we are certain from divine Scripture ground,  
*Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, &c. thou shalt not bow down thy self unto them, Exod. 20. 4,*  
 5. *When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in Heaven, Luk. 11. 2. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only*

*ly shalt thou serve, Matt. 4. 10. In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doct'rins the commandments of men, Mat. 15.*

9. 3. True it is we have the same grounds of assurance for all points of Christian Religion, affirmatively, negatively, respect had to their Verity; and yet have we not the same grounds for all, respect had unto their Charity; and therefore may we have assurance for all upon the same grounds, yet not the same assurance. 4. The Spirit is sent in a special manner to convince the world of sin, for not believing, and to perswade all the Elect to believe in Jesus Christ. But which, or how many other points the Holy Ghost will certainly give in evidence for, or against, I shall not determine.

*Thirdly, Suppose I were willing upon their perswasions, to relinquish this way, wherein I now am; what sort of Christianity (viz. whether the way of the Lutheran or Calvinist, of the Greek Church, or of the Armenian, or Ethiopian, or whether*

whether the way of the *English Independents*, or *Anabaptists*, or *Quakers*, or of the *Fifth-monarchy-men*, or the way of the new *Arrians*, or *Socinians*, or any other, and what) shall I follow, and why, as the only secure way to salvation? or is it enough to secure my salvation, if I be a Christian opposing the Roman Church, and believe, or disbelieve what I please, so it be in contradiction to the Roman Church?

1. I can easily suppose you convinced of the naughtiness of the way that you are in, and yet at present cannot suppose you willing to relinquish it for any of those ways you mention; indeed there is another way you seem to be thinking of, because you say nothing of it; and had not your perfidiousness been such, that the Chieftains thereof will not allow you preferment, I little question but they have Motives that might work upon you. 2. The way (as you call it) of the *Lutherans*, the way of the *Calvinists*, *Arminians*, *English*  
Inde-

*Independents*; be not several sorts of Christianity, or several ways to salvation; but several opinions held out, several forms of Government under which several Christians live, that are all in the same secure way to salvation, viz. Jesus Christ: and therefore, 3. I shall not perswade you first or last, to be of any of these ways, but, as you say well, to become a Christian, believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and him alone for salvation: and then as to other points, believe, or disbelieve, not what you please, but what God in an humble use of lawful means shall be pleased to make known unto you; *Lord what wilt thou have me to do?* Acts 9. 6. And then though I cannot tell which of the ways fore-mentioned you'll be for, may be for none; yet certain I am you'll stand up with me in contradiction to the Church of *Rome*: because she above all other Sects, sets herself most notoriously to contradict our on y Lord Jesus Christ; will needs sit as God in the Temple of God.

God. However, 4. suppose I were willing upon your persuasions to relinquish this way wherein I now am, what sort of Popery (*vis.* whether the way of the Dominicans, Jesuits, or Franciscans, or the way of the *French* or *Italian*, or the way of your *Thomists* or *Scotists*, nominal or reals, or whether the way of *J. S.* who makes Tradition, or the way of *R. E.* who makes the Church the Rule of Faith, or any other and what) shall I follow, and why, as the only secure way to salvation? or is it enough to secure my Salvation, if I be a Papist opposing the Protestant Churches, and believe or disbelieve what the Priest my Confessor pleases, so it be in contradiction to the Protestant Churches?

If it be said, that yet for all this you do not differ in points of Faith: We answer, First, you differ in what is more considerable, the foundation and Rule: *J. S.* and his party holding Tradition; *R. E.* and his party holding the Church to be the

the Rule of Faith : And then in a subdivision, the *Jesuits* holding the Pope ; The *French* maintaining that the Council ; and *R. E.* again that the vast community of all Christians, &c. ought to be meant by the Church. Nor does it end thus ; *Bellarmin* holds that by Miracles the Church can be proved true no more than credibly ; you'll needs prove your Church by Miracles to be the universal Judge, and the infallible Guide of Faith, and that certainly *certitudine fidei*, directly contrary to, and far enough beyond what *Bellarmin* ever attempted. 20 The differences betwixt the *Jesuits* and the *Dominicans*, Whether God pre-determinate every action, Whether Election and Reprobation depend upon foresight, be about points of Faiths, and more material than any point in Controversie betwixt *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and *Anabaptists* : If you say you agree in all points your Church has defin'd to be of Faith, it's not simply and unanimously, as you pretend to agree in all points of Faith ; but in all your



Church has defin'd or can agree that you should agree in, whose definitions and politick Arbitrations, together with your irrational forced submissions, be nothing to us, nor to the Question. However you use to tell us herewithal, that an agreement in the letter or words is worth nothing, unless there be an agreement in sense. And now you controvert the sense of almost all your Churches definitions. Due Honour and veneration, saith your Church, must be given to Images, and then one sort of you conclude the Image in it self must not in any manner be worshipped, but only the exemplar be worshipped before the Image: Another sort, that the same honour is due to the Image, as is due to the exemplar: And a third sort, that the Images in themselves, and properly, ought to be honoured, but with a lesser Honour than the exemplar it self: and if you urge yet, that you all agree the definitions to be true in the sense intended by the Church her self, we reply that you your selves

*Cont. Trid.  
Sess. 25.*

*Bellar. de  
Imag. sanct.  
l. 2. c. 20.*

selves be the Church, that thus falls out about the sense, do not know what's your own meaning; and add further, that we all agree the Scriptures to be true in the sense intended by God, yet will not that content you.

*Fourthly*, Whether they, who would teach me that sort of Christianity to be the only Religion, wherein Salvation is to be attained, which they would have me follow and imbrace, be infallible in their teaching of this particular?

We do not tell you of this or that sort of Christianity being the only Religion, wherein, but of Jesus being the only Christ, through faith, in whom Salvation is to be attained; and though we dare not say, that we are infallible in teaching this particular, yet are we certain that this particular which we teach is true infallibly, and that one infallible according to Christs own promise, *Matt. 28. 20.* goes along with

as in teaching thereof; your Priests want such company; and therefore not being able their Ministry powerfully to evidence in mens understandings, the verity of what they set themselves to Preach, they labour to set up an infallible visible Authority, unto which they most impudently aver, that all persons must and ought to yield a blind obedience.

*Fifthly,* Whether they are infallibly sure, that all who do not follow and embrace that sort of Christianity which they would have me follow and embrace, shall be damned?

*1.* You are always in hand with your several sorts of Christianity, an expression will become one, that hath Christian for his name; and Catholicks for his Surname, and therefore disclaimed by us. *2.* We

2. We tell you that all those that imbrace Jesus Christ by Faith, and follow him in love, so far as shall be made known unto them whom we perswade you to imbrace and follow, shall be certainly saved, and those that do not, shall be certainly damned.

3. Such Sectaries as you, that make severall sorts of Christianity, and maintain it to be necessary to Salvation, in all things to obey and follow this or that sort of Christianity, do certainly deserve for that very thing to be eternally damned: But what God will do either with you or them, left herein we should be like you, I shall not determine.

*Sixthly*, Supposing that they are not infallible in these particulars, whether will it not rationally, and necessarily follow, that possibly I may at present be in the right way, and they in an error; and if so,

what reason can they give, why I should forsake my present Guide, whom I believe to be infallible, to follow them who confess they may be, and therefore, for ought they know, are at present mistaken in what they believe and practise?

*First*, If we neither did, nor could bring any other proof for these particulars, save our own Testimony (fallibility on our part supposed) it would rationally and necessarily follow *quoad nos*, that possibly at least you might be in the right way, and we in an error: Though yet, *quoad rem ipsam*, the sequel, this notwithstanding, be impossible, because these particulars might be in themselves infallibly true, and we neither know, nor be able to evince it.

*Secondly*, You may strongly imagine, but if your own principles abide firm, you cannot, do not believe, that the Roman Church your present

present Guide is infallible : For Faith, according to you, is an infallible assent of the understanding, submitting it self obediently to the revelations of God : And therefore sith you have no revelation of God for, but one express against, the infallibility of the Roman Church, *Rom. 11. 22.* Your own definition will tell you, it is impossible that your understanding should exert an Act of Faith about it ; nor yet, suppose you had divine Revelation for it, or that God himself should say to you, the Roman Church is infallible, were you ere the hearer. For it's possible you may commit an error, nay err in your understanding of those words ; and consequently your understanding never give an infallible assent to that which God intended, by them. Howbeit,

*Thirdly,* We can tell you as formerly, that *à posse ad esse non valet Argumentum* : it follows not, we

G 5

may



may be, therefore we are; or we confess we may be, therefore for ought we know at present, we are mistaken, &c. for though we still confess we may be mistaken in what we believe and practise, respect had to our desert, and natural proneness, yet do we know that God of his mercy, through the Ministry of his word, hath at present fully satisfied us, that as to the main we are not; and if in some things we differ and wander, yet doubt we not but God for Christs sake, will pardon our errors, as well as our other sins, and cause us to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, *Nevertheless whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same Rule, let us mind the same things, Phil. 3. 16.* However,

*Fourthly,* We do not desire you to forsake your present Guide and follow us; but to forsake your present Guide, us, and your own selfish humour, and follow the Lord Jesus.

Jesus Christ. You pretend and would have us to believe the Romish Church to be infallible independently on the Scriptures, because God by Miracles, as you imagine, has confirmed it so to be; and sith so, we would have you at least allow us to believe Scriptural Doctrines, confessedly so confirmed independently on that Church, or else excuse your self from being an Heretick, sith you'll believe, nay, press others to believe one proposition, and refuse another equally proposed at your own account: Nor may this be retorted upon us either by Mr. Johnson or you. For,

*First*, Though we own all the gifts Christ gave unto Men for the perfecting of the Saints; and work of the Ministry, according to Eph. 4. 11, 12. yet do we neither claim nor admit of such a propounding Authority, as you without any *Pag. 9.* divine warrant pretend unto.

2. Though

2. Though your Church equally impose all her Tenets, respect had to her own usurped power; yet does she not equally propose all, respect had to the evidencing of their truth. For some she proposes as Divine, but does not prove them so to be, as her Doctrines about the real Presence, and Pur-  
 Pag. 81. gatory: others she not only proposes as such, but evidently evinces them to be Divinely revealed; as the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation: to these we assent, those we except against as not sufficiently represented to us: And yet say,

3. That two propositions may be equally proposed to, and not equally work upon the understanding: preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, and preaching the Gospel to the *Jews*, were both proposed with equal evidence and Authority, *Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel unto every Creature,*

ture, Mark 16. 15. and yet did Peter with a thousand others believe that, and disbelieve this without any crime of Heresie, if of prejudice or inadvertency imputed to them.

If there be any who hath any value for the Authority of the great S. *Austin*, I shall beseech them to read this following Text of that Saint, and to consider whether I have not in my proceedings observed his Rule and Method; and let them but change the word *Manicheus* into *John Calvin*, and how nearly it will concern them.

S. *Augustin* against the Epistle of *Manicheus*, which they call fundamental, cap. 5. edit. Paris. Tom. 61. 46. If thou shalt find any one who doth not as yet believe the Gospel, what wilt thou do when he shall say unto thee, I do not believe? But neither had I believed the Gospel,

spel, unless I had been thereunto moved by the Authority of the Catholick Church: Those therefore to whom I submitted, when they required me to believe the Gospel, why should I not also yield obedience unto them, when they direct me not to believe *Manichæus*? Take your choice; if you tell me I must believe the Catholicks, they give me advice not to give credit to you; and therefore if I believe them I cannot but refuse to believe you. If you tell me I must not believe the Catholicks; you proceed ill, when you go about by the Gospel to perswade me to believe *Manichæus*, because it was from the Preachings of the Catholicks, that I believe the Gospel is self. If you tell me I did well when I believed the Catholicks praising the Gospel, but I do ill when I believe the same persons decrying *Manichæus*, do you take me to be so stupid as without any reason given unto me I should believe or disbelieve what you

you please? &c. But if you have  
 any Reason to offer unto me,  
 lay aside the Gospel; if you hold  
 your self to the Gospel, I shall  
 adhere to thole upon whose com-  
 mands I believe the Gospel, and  
 so long as I obey them I shall not  
 believe you. But if by accident  
 you should find any thing in the  
 Gospel most evidently touching  
 the Apostleship of *Manichæus*,  
 you will weaken the Authority of  
 the Catholicks in my esteem, who  
 require me not to believe you; but  
 that being weakened I shall not be-  
 lieve the Gospel, because I believe  
 that by them: so that whatsoe-  
 ver you bring from the Gospel  
 will be of no force with me.  
 Wherefore if nothing be found in  
 the Gospel for the manifestation  
 of *Manichæus* his Apostleship, I  
 shall rather give credit to Catho-  
 licks than you. But if any thing  
 shall be there found manifest on  
 the behalf of *Manichæus*, I shall  
 neither believe them nor you; Not  
 them, because they told me a lie  
 of



of you; nor shall I believe you, because you urge that Scripture to me, which I believe upon their Authority, who told me a lie in relation to you, &c.

1. S. *Augustine* may be considered either as a Witness acquainting us, what the Church then held, or as a Doctour rationally deducing and proving of conclusions: had you quoted him under the former notion, I should not have questioned the truth of any thing that Great *Augustine* had said, without undeniable evidence to the contrary. But sith you cite him as Doctor, I shall value S. *Austin's* Authority, as S. *Austin* had learned to value the Authority of other pious learned Doctors of, or before his time, not credit what he saith, because he saith it, but because he proves it true, either by Canonical Authorities or probable Reasons. Howbeit,

2. You observe the Rule and Me-

Method not of Saint *Austin*, but Mr. *Knot*, substituting *John Calvin*, for *Manicheans*; and I might by the same Rule observe the Method of Mr. *Chillingworth*, substitute *Arians*, as great pretenders then, as the Papists are now, for the Catholick Church; put *Goth* or *Vandal* converted by them for S. *Austin*, for *Manicheans* write *Homousians*, and then try whether the Argument, if but first fitted to your purpose, be not, as he says, like a buskin that will fit any leg: but I shall wave this, and in a just parallel let you see plainly how far different your proceedings are from those of the great S. *Austin*. First then S. *Austin* speaks of an Infidel that did not as yet believe the Gospel; you direct your speech to Christians, Protestants, that do already believe it, and that upon the account of Universal Tradition, the Scriptures, and the Divine Attestations of Miracles, far better grounds than your Popish principles can or will allow. Secondly, S. *Austin* supposes such a one to  
 come

come and say I do not believe, and thereupon seeks to bring him to, and establish him in the faith: you deal with such as say they do believe, and seek to overturn their faith established as aforesaid, averring it's no better than fancy and an humour: thus did not *Austin*. Thirdly, S. *Austin* speaks in the singular number, and preter Tense, Neither had I believed the Gospel, unless I had been thereunto moved by the Authority of the Catholick Church: You speak in the plural and present Tense, we must not, do not, believe the Gospel, unless our Faith be founded upon the Authority and infallibility of that society of Christians, which is in Communion with, and in subjection to the Bishop of Rome. Fourthly, those to whom *Austin* submitted, required him to believe the Gospel and disbelieve *Manichæus*, who held two first Principles, and consequently two Gods, and maintained several other erroneous apparently repugnant thereunto:

unto : those to whom you have submitted, require you to believe the Real presence ; Purgatory. Image-worship, with other such like Humane inventions, and disbelieve Calvin, who teacheth the Gospel, and declares against all such Doctrins as do not accord therewith. Fifthly , We do not advise you to believe the Romanists, nor did you at the first believe the Gospel by the Romanists Preaching, but by the preaching of the Protestants : And therefore if you'l adhere to those upon whose grounds you did at first believe the Gospel, so long as you obey them, you shall not believe the Romanists; and if they say ( what one would think they should ) you did well when you believed the Protestants preaching of the Gospel, but do ill when you believe the same persons decrying the Romanists, are you so stupid as without any reason given unto you, to believe or disbelieve what they please? &c. Had you indeed been bred a Papist, and then could have proved the Papists the

the only Catholicks, and Protestants  
as gross Hereticks as the *Manichees*,  
there might have been some ground  
for your parallel with *S. Austin*; as  
it is, you proceed upon a three-  
fold disadvantage and disparity.

---

**F I N I S.**

---







